P. J. McGowan

McGowan

Washington

1910

P.J. MC. GOWEN

THE

CONTROVERSIAL DISCUSSION

BETWEEN THE

REV. MR. MAGUIRE AND THE REV. MR. GREGG.

FIRST DAY.—Tuesday, May 29th, 1838.

THE doors of the Round Room of the Rotundo were thrown open at ten o'clock, and from that hour until eleven, the hour appointed for the discussion, the pressure of the crowd was great indeed—at intervals threatening serious consequences. Shortly before the hour, the room was entirely filled—every face anxiously looking towards the platform to get a glimpse of the combatants. Shortly before eleven o'clock the Rev. Mr. Gregg made his appearance on the platform, with two large bags filled with books, accompanied by the Rev. Mr. Nangle, of the Island of Achill, and was almost immediately followed by the Rev. Mr. Maguire, who was accompanied by the Rev. Justin M'Namara, P.P., of Kinsale. Partial cheering commenced, but was immediately suppressed by the good sense of the meeting. A great many ladies were also present, and evinced an interest in the discussion not exceeded by the gentlemen. Too much credit cannot be given to those gentlemen who conducted the arrangements. At both sides of the room ranges of seats were erected for the accommodation of the ladies; seats were also placed in the centre; and under the platform was placed a large table for the accommodation of the reporters for the public press. Two other tables were placed on the top of the platform, where both the chairmen sat, the Rev. Mr. Gregg being seated at the left hand of the Rev. Mr. Nangle, and the Rev. Mr. Maguire at the right of the Rev. Justin M'Namara. Eleven o'clock having arrived, that moment which many a palpitating heart looked forward to,

The Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE rose and said—I now call on my Rev. friend, the Rev. Mr. Gregg, for his proofs that the Protestant Church in England and Ireland is the Church of Christ in these countries—holy, catholic, and apostolic.

The Rev. Mr. GREGG—First of all, it is necessary to take a preliminary step—that of appointing a chairman, and I therefore appoint the Rev. Edmund Nangle, of the Island of Achill.

The Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—And I appoint the Rev. Justin M'Namara, P. P., of Kinsale.

The Rev. Mr. GREGG—Gentlemen, there is another step which it is proper to take before we proceed to actual business, and that is, that

either of the rev. chairmen would read the published propositions which have been agreed to between us, and by which this meeting has been convened.

The Rev. Mr. Nangle then read them.

The Rev. Mr. GREGG—I undertake to prove the assertion made that the Protestant Church of England and Ireland is the Church of Christ—in these countries is the true Church of Christ.

The Rev. JUSTIN M'NAMARA—And the Rev. Mr. Maguire to disprove them.

The Rev. Mr. GREGG—I beg to trouble Mr. Maguire with another question. On what day would it be convenient to carry the third condition into effect—namely, that of excluding the ladies.

The Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—Any day you please—say Friday or Saturday.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Then let it be Saturday.

The Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—Very well.

The Rev. Mr. GREGG—Gentlemen, having thus disposed of a few preliminary regulations, I would, in the first place, unaffectedly express the sincere pleasure I feel at the conduct pursued all through by the Rev. Mr. Maguire, and, if he have no objection, myself and those who think along with me will supplicate a blessing from above on the result of this discussion.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—There are so many persons present of different religious communions, that perhaps it would be better if each person offered up a silent paayer, and not again reap up those differences which unfortunately exist between us.

The Rev. Mr. GREGG—May God influence the minds of those who are in error.

The Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—And may the great God in unity and trinity assist and help all, more especially him who has truth at his side.

The Rev. Mr. GREGG then commenced—Gentlemen, I should consider myself as acting very improperly, perhaps, if I delayed a moment in calling your attention to the circumstances of this challenge, and the terms and correspondence which led to it. I am quite sure, Sir, that nothing which shall occur in this matter, or the results which will follow, rest with me or Mr. Maguire. The great subject of consideration for us all is the principles we maintain and an earnest desire to have them asserted, without any allusion as to the result of this discussion; and I think it unnecessary for me, therefore, to dwell just now upon them. I have formed my own conclusion, and shall only, in reference to them, say, that I felt it my duty to come forward, and that I feel, in a great degree, relieved from considerable anxiety as to the manner in which it shall terminate. Gentlemen, I will now state to you, in the first instance, that I do not stand here as the representative of any body—that I am here entirely on my own responsibility, to maintain my own opinions as contradistinguished to my Reverend opponent; yet I will not have you to think that I disclaim any connection with a particular body. I desire to view myself as standing alone on my own responsibility with regard to that body; but, with reference to my own opinions, to sustain them as a member of the Holy Catholic Church, and to bring forward the mind and spirit of that Church. There is no one who entertains a feeling of hesitation, as regards a matter of this kind, more than I do. I can assure you that in coming here my object was not to put forward my own private opinions, but to discover the mind of the church in union with God's

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

word, and to assure myself that it was instituted on and founded by the holy Scriptures and the Holy Spirit of God; and, although not representing my brethren, yet I will give the *opinion* and doctrines of my church, open to correction by them, if at variance with the principles upon which it is founded. Gentlemen, the two propositions before us are, first, that the Church of England is the Holy Catholic Church in these kingdoms; and, secondly, that she is holy and apostolic. I would desire to impress upon you the intimate connection which subsists between the two; for, in fact, *our church was a branch of the Roman Catholic Church*, which laid aside those doctrines taught by the apostles, and adopted practices totally at variance with that doctrine, and which necessarily grew out of that corruption. We are the *reformed* Catholic Church of England and Ireland, and hence there is an intimate connection between the two positions I have put forward; for, if the Church of Rome be holy and pure in doctrine, and in practice unexceptionable, we should, of necessity, be schismatic or apostates in departing from her communion; and hence my determination to connect both is essential to establish the second proposition—namely, the holiness of our Irish Catholic Reformed Church. I desire, in the first place, to make matters clear, as an expression in my letter had been generally misunderstood, because of the use of the definite article before the words "true church in these kingdoms." I assert she is the true church in these kingdoms—but it has been said that it would have been more appropriate if I had used the words "*a* Holy Catholic Church." I beg leave to tell you, Gentlemen, I disapprove of that mode of expression, and that it is contrary to the articles of our creed, by which we are taught, that there is one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church; and if I had made use of the term "a Holy Catholic Church," it would countenance the idea that the Church of Christ was not one. It has been also said that I should not have designated the Church of England as a branch of the Church, Holy Catholic and Apostolic. I cannot say that that language would have been correct; on the contrary, mine is more explicit, for when I say the Holy and Apostolic Church in these kingdoms, it necessarily implies that she is a branch of it, and thus you perceive the language I used is strictly defensible and proper. Gentlemen, in order to maintain my two propositions, I must go back to the first principles of Christianity in order to see what its object really was. Our world had been reduced to a state of ruin by nature—we are all the children of fallen parents, and, by the law of God, condemned to destruction from the presence of the Lord—we were totally disentitled to divine favour in consequence of this unfortunate apostacy of our first parents, as well as our iniquities, the natural result of our own conduct. But it pleased God, in his mercy and free grace, to determine to reclaim the earth from the guilt of sin, to redeem us from the curse which had been entailed upon us, and to put us in the way of escaping from the damnation of hell, and obtaining heaven, where we were originally intended for. The world was sunk under the bondage of Satan, when God the Son came down to reclaim it—to make righteousness cover the earth, as the nightly waters cover the deep—and thus restore man to that position from which he had so lamentably fallen. It had been covenanted to him to give the heavens for the possession of man—and "from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof may his name be glorified." To accomplish this great work he appeared on earth, and to commence the work he established a small society which he taught and instructed, in order to the

Acc. 769

proper maintenance of his holy doctrine, and commanded it to increase and multiply, according to certain laws—to extend itself over the world, until it *should* at length cover the whole earth. This society is the Church, the members of which are increased by an ordination called baptism, by which as by a door, the members are admitted. Over this society *officers* are appointed by means of another ordination, called orders, and I think it will be found that I and my reverend opponent agree that these *officers* are as essential to the establishment of that society as the society itself. The Church in the beginning was pure and holy, and even during the life time of the Apostles it extended itself so far and wide, that St. Paul and others are found to have gone into other lands, and to preach to the people words "which are not of this world." That society extended itself, according to history, into Britain, even in St. Paul's time—some say by his instrumentality, and others by Joseph of Arimathea.—That, however, does not matter much—it is an uncertain tradition, but it does not however render invalid any essential part of my argument. The doctrine of the Church spread far and wide—and, Gentlemen, mark me now, while I draw a necessary and an important distinction—namely, that even during the life time of Jesus Christ—glory be to his name for ever and ever—we have reason to believe there were divisions among his followers, for we find the Apostles at one time came and told him that they had seen people casting out devils, and requesting that he would interpose his authority to forbid them. What was his reply? No, said he, "no one can cast out devils in my name, and he that is not with us is against us." Then, if they cast out devils in his name, it must have been according to godliness, and yet he said he would not forbid them. That sort of doctrine is called a schism; there was a schism in the Church of Corinth, in St. Paul's time, as we find by his epistle alluding to the Neopholites and Nicholoites. In the Church of Galatia it existed likewise, which must lead us to glorify God that out of all cometh good to man. In the course of time others sprung up which obtained the name of heretics, such as the Donatists, the Apollonarians, and others, which were also called Christians; and it is necessary for me to draw these distinctions, in order to ascertain did those individuals belong to the common body, or to the particular body. Those belonging to the common body were called Catholics, because they were very general—and now you can conceive that these private sects propagated their doctrines, and formed other communities free from corruption, just as the Church of Christ was holy and pure in doctrine and discipline. I use the term Catholic, not as a positive, but as a relative term—not individually, nor to show that the extension was universal, for it never was so. There never was a time when Catholicity extended itself over the entire world—it was then, as we think, a distinct term. Now, follow me, Gentlemen—and I pray God your eyes may be opened in order that you may understand what I shall advance. The next branch of my statement is (which, with the blessing of the Lord, I will prove to be correct to the satisfaction of all here present) that while Christ declared "the gates of hell should never prevail against his Church," and that she should stand firm as a rock, regardless of the billows by which she was surrounded, he should accomplish the grand work for which he came on earth. He did tell us that while standing and boldly maintaining her ground, and in the maintenance of her integrity, that epoch should be connected with an amazing mystery, that while apostacy should overtake the whole Church, so far as she was visible, the pine of the Church

would bring forth grapes of Sodom and Gomorrah. We are told the nature of the doctrines which she should teach—the place where she should hold her seat—the time she should continue till the terrible and overwhelming evil should come upon her, greater than has as yet ever appeared on the earth. All these things are consistent with the doctrine "that the gates of hell should never prevail against his Church," for he has told us that during *this time the Church would teach blasphemous fables*, although at the same time having the stream of faith running through her, and the integrity of her principles kept alive *by a few witnesses*, who would be produced to form her existing apostacy—that in the end a pure and holy Church would come out from amidst the general mass of corruption and apostacy. Gentlemen, I trust you understand the views I have taken, and I know it is sometimes essential to make things plain to the eye, so as that there may be no mistake—and for that purpose look at this——

[*Here the Rev. Gentleman exhibited to the audience, amid some tittering, a large representation of a river, the source of which was drawn in colours of gold, to represent the purity which existed in the primitive days of the Church. The centre was drawn in colours of blood, which was intended to show the corruption which subsequently crept into her; and at the termination the gold again appeared, which the Rev. Gentleman said represented the Reformed Church of England and Ireland, pure and apostolic, flowing out of the mass of error and infidelity which prevailed for so many centuries. He again continued.—There is a simile of the practices exhibited in the church. It is said that she is the vine, and that the other Churches are the branches—but there is the gold coming out from amidst the filth which surround it—a perfect representation of the Scarlet W———. Gentlemen, I mean no offence, I assure you, by one single word which I shall utter in the course of this discussion, but merely to assert what I conceive to be the truth; and I sincerely hope that the Rev. Mr. Maguire will become a convert to the holy Catholic Church ere this shall terminate, as established in England and Ireland. The corruption, like that coming from a dead man, shall pass away, and the awful judgment which it deserves shall come upon it.*]

Here the half hour ceased, when

The Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE rose and said—Gentlemen, I suppose you are already *half-persuaded* that the united Protestant Church of England and Ireland is the Church of Christ in these kingdoms. I really cannot perceive what the speech of the rev. gentleman has to do with the question before us, but perhaps that is owing to my natural want of intellect. How any thing that has been said bears directly or indirectly on the subject of our discussion, I am at a loss to perceive. The rev. gentleman has certainly exhibited an admirable picture (a titter). I really thought it was the Falls of Niagara (tittering continued). He has proved to you that the original Church was gold, and that Jesus Christ was the vine, in all of which I agree with him. I agree with him when he says that the Church was like the vine, which, by degrees, extended herself so as to cover the whole world; and then he tells you of the schisms which took place. I really felt for him, because I know he is a man of consummate ingenuity, and was becoming desperate when he undertook to defend schism and heresy, as a proof that Jesus Christ established a church of unity upon earth. He should have explained the horrible effects of schism, and the power which the church always exercised in suppressing it; instead of that he tells you the first and second man who commenced it.

The circumstance to which he alluded as causing a difference in the church was whether Cephas, or Paul, or Apollo were the best preacher; but is that to be compared to the heresy of Simon Magus, who rent asunder the seamless garment of Jesus Christ? Heresy is derived from the Greek word *heresis*, that is, a person who choses for himself any particular religion. Schism, from that of the Greek word *scisma*—which means a lopping off, or one who formes a schism. Of that St John the Evangelist speaks when he says, "they went from us—they were not of us—if they were they would not have gone." Thus, therefore, Simon Magus, and all the rest of the tail who pretended to sustain themselves apart from the church, were punished by spiritual excommunication. They are not of the body, for, as St. Paul says, "a man that is a heretic after the first and second admonition, knowing such a man sinneth, is condemned by his own judgment." If a man is allowed to exercise his own judgement for himself, why should he be ejected? but because he was not, and became the object of God's wrath, not only he says against the original body but against the purity of the doctrines taught by them, therefore it was so. St. Paul further tells you that he would not eat meat with, or sit with a heretic, and St. John the Evangelist, as told by the learned Eusebius, on his going to the baths at Rome, accompanied by Polycarp, begged of him to run out of the place, fearing the baths would fall upon them if any schismatic or heretic were to enter. All the great men of antiquity—all the learned, and holy, and pious of old, were the very men that were heretics, according to my opponent, and with whom he seeks now to convert himself. Saint John the Evangelist, in writing in the Apocalypse (upon which so much is depended upon), recommends one of the bishops of Asia, because of his conduct in censuring those Nicholites of whom we have heard so much. They were condemned by the holy and apostolic church, which proves the power she always exercised in condemning refractory members. Arian, likewise, set up a school for himself, when a general council was called, and he and seven others were condemned by that council, which is recognized by my rev. opponent and his followers. He says, that Jesus Christ foretold "the gates of hell should never prevail against his church," and he adds, nevertheless, that Christ foretold a tremendous apostacy would take place in that very church. My friend has told you that a great apostacy did take place—that visible witnesses were at the time in existence to prove this apostacy—that man, woman, and priest, up to the appearance of Luther, were living in dismal idolatry and damnation to man—that Jesus Christ, for a period of eighteen hundred years, did not leave any evidence of his church being in existence — (believe that if you can!) and then he tells you the meaning of Catholicity or universality is, that it was spread over the world—that at least it ought to be, but was not. These are his assertions, but where are the proofs? I deny his interpretation of universality; it is intended as a beacon of light—as a mark by which the ignorant would be enabled to discover the true Church of Christ; and of all the Christian societies, taken particularly and separately, the Catholic Church of Jesus Christ is the only living, clear and visible mark easily to be distinguished—a way so easily attained that a fool cannot err in seeking after it. How will a poor ignorant man, who knows nothing of maps, such as we have seen here to day [a titter] find out the school of Jesus Christ if he is to follow the doctrine laid down by my reverend opponent. He says it is the Protestant Church *in these* kingdoms which

is to give him information as to what the true Church of Christ is; and now mark what he says of schism, and his insinuation that it was always tolerated in the Church. Saints Paul and Barnabas went to preach at Antioch, where they met some opposition on the part of the Jews, who insisted that circumcision was necessary. Great disputes arose among them; and what was the consequence? An appeal to the College of Apostles at Jerusalem, whom my reverend opponent has called officers (he was afraid to call them priests [a titter]—priests are officers, but officers may not be priests—and what was the consequence (mind you if the right of private judgment existed, each individual could decide for himself)? Saints Paul and Barnabas prosecuted the appeal, and what was the judgment of the apostles? They decided against the Judeans, who never said one word against the decision, and concluded by saying, "it seems good to the Holy Ghost and to us." Now, I ask him, who seems so delighted at the prospect of converting me, am I in the wrong? If that church exercised this power, when did it afterwards disappear—at what period—who was the Pope, the emperor, the king, or the historian who lived—in what century? That Church, in the space of four hundred years, afterwards converted Italy, Germany, Portugal, the Low Countries, France, Spain, and even England herself—nay, the world was at one time under her dominion. What induced those of her communion to allow their properties to be destroyed—to be tied at the stake and given to wild beasts—to be subjected to every suffering which human ingenuity could invent? Why, they must have been the greatest fools in the universe if, according to my reverend friend, they were living in abomination, and subject to all the pains of eternal punishment. Why did the wild beasts refuse to eat them? Why did they lick the martyrs' feet, instead of devouring them? And I will ask what other church existed at that time, as the Church of Christ, but the Holy Roman and Apostolic Church? St. Paul gave thanks to the Romans for the manner in which they acted, and will he tell me when the Church of Christ ceased to exist? What was the first heresy she broached, or the error she fell into? Who was the Pope, or where did it happen, or what man dared in any age to broach one, that was not instantly excommunicated? What was done with Arian? Was the Roman Catholic Church apostate in declaring that the Son was consubstantial with the Father, and what church did so before the appearance of Luther and Calvin? Did we not possess the faith for one thousand years; and when Luther rebelled, did he not say that *he stood alone?* He was bound to make an act of faith when he reformed. To what church did he make it? There must have been a Catholic Church in existence, or else Christ did not perform his promise. What church was that?—where was the visible Church of Christ on earth? Oh! it is a fallacy to deny that there was one. You know Christ said, "He that will not hear the church let him be as a heathen and a publican;" and St. Paul adds, "obey your prelates." How can you hear the church if no church exists? and is it reason or common sense to enjoin a commandment to obey your prelates if there be none to obey? If then a church existed from the time of the Apostles to the Reformation, must it not be the true Church of Christ? and if that church erred, is it not blasphemy against the eternal God, who pledged himself "that the gates of hell

should never prevail against it, and that he should be with it all days, even to the consummation of the world?" How is it possible for a man who alleges she fell into error to convert a Jew, for instance? His answer would be, your church fell into idolatry, and remained so for 1,000 years, and then he would quote the prophet Ezekiah, chap.xxxvi. ver. 25, where he foretold the Church of God should never fall into idolatry. Your church, he would add, has fallen,and what pretensions have you to say that your religion is that founded by the Almighty God? Here is the saying of the prophet, and what proofs have you that your religion is a good one, when you cannot deny that it continued in error, and worshipped falsely for 1,000 years? Gentlemen, it does not follow that even if the Church of Rome were wrong the Protestant Church of England or Ireland is right—for indeed I have not heard one word in defence of that Church as yet; and what I have said I was not called upon in point of argument to do; but this I must say, that the Dissenters sail in the same vessel with myself. We are alike opposed to the tyrannical, grasping, luxurious Church establishment, which puts its hands into the pockets of the people, and when you have nothing to give, will curse and excommunicate you. We are obliged to support their wives and children, and their daughters, if married to parsons [hear, hear, from Mr. Gregg]. Gentlemen, there is not a single argument my reverend opponent has used—indeed, if he has used any—which in the name of the Dissenters I will not use against himself. I am not as bigotted to suppose for one moment that God in his mercy cannot save a man in any church, providing he exerts himself to find the truth. We know there are heretics and schismatics, but we cannot account for the motives which actuate them. We may indeed give a guess as to the motives of those apostates who go out from amongst us; but the man who, from a false education, has been reared in prejudices, but who has done his endeavours to reach at the truth—if such a case can be supposed—I would be sorry to say, indeed, he should be included among heretics; for, as St. Paul says, "Woe to heretics who are self-willed." We have condemned the Arians and Socinians, and if I should stand up here and broach a heresy, like the man who burned the Temple of Ephesus—if I should say to my reverend friend, you are not allowed to have a second coat—you are not allowed to defend a suit at law, if one should be instituted against you—if you be struck on one cheek, you must turn the other—if I broach such a heresy, how will my reverend opponent answer me? If there is nothing but the Bible, that which contains the true revelation of God——

Here the half hour ended.

Mr. Gregg—I entreat your attention, in my reply to what has been urged by my rev. friend, Mr. Maguire, and I must repeat that I stand here as a member of the Church of England, not as a private individual; and I will stand by the Church of England, God willing, with my latest breath. I must be very brief in my observations on such parts of Mr. Maguire's speech as deserve to be noticed in reply. He accuses me of standing solely on private judgment. As a member of the Church of England I hold that the Church is the judge in matters of faith, and so far I believe Mr. Maguire will not differ much from me in matters of ecclesiastical dicipline. The Church then has the power to condemn

heresies, but, when I say so, I speak of the Holy Catholic Church, and not of an unholy and fallen church. I do not stand—and I pray you to mark me – I do not stand on the paramount right of private judgment; and *I condemn private mis-judgment.* I say in the first place that the right of public judgment is vested in the Church, and in the second place that the private judgment of individuals, when justly exercised, will accord with the public judgment of the Church. I will, for instance, take an example from mathematics. Who will say that a man has not a right to exercise his private judgment in mathematics? Suppose a man should imagine that he has discovered that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles and a half, will we not say to him, if you have such an opinion you may certainly entertain it, but you stand alone, for the opinion of mankind is against you? It is thus with the public judgment of the Church, as it guides that of individuals. When I sometimes see myself in difficulties, and that I think on any point differently from the Church, without wandering in the error, I say to myself, wait awhile and I pray to the Lord Jesus to enlighten and direct me, and I soon find that my private judgment was only hasty, and thus incorrect. We condemn the heretics because they will not admit any public judgment, and we are opposed to the Church of Rome because it will not recognise private judgment. It is for a union of both that the Church of England contends. Mr. Maguire asserts that the Church of England can make no converts to Christianity among the Jews. Now, one fact is better than any argument, and I could bring a thousand facts to disprove Mr. Maguire's assertion. Is it not notorious that it is by the Church of England alone that the Jews are converted? I once asked a Jew who had been converted to Christianity, and who had resided in Poland, what his opinions with regard to Christianity were previous to his conversion? His reply was, that while he saw images paraded through the streets, and idolatrous processions, and every species of superstitions practised, he was disgusted with Christianity, and regarded it as the greatest abomination; but that when he came to England, and there saw the Christian religion taught in all its simplicity and purity, he changed his former opinions, and gladly embraced it. It is then notorious that the Church of Rome is the mother of every species of superstition; and if I may use the expression, she is also the mother of the hard-heartedness of the unbelieving Jews. Mr. Maguire has said that there could be no idolatry in the Christian Church, and has cited scripture for that purpose. I will point out to him in the scripture the most direct prophecies of that idolatry in the Church. I will call his attention to the prophet Zachariah, chap. xi. verse 16, where it is said, "I will raise up a shepherd in the land, which shall not visit those that be cut off, neither shall seek the young one nor heal that that is broken, nor feed that that standeth still; but he shall eat the flesh of the fat, and tear their claws in pieces. Woe to the idol shepherd that leaveth the flock! the sword shall be upon his arm, and upon his right eye; his arm shall be clean dried up, and his right eye shall be utterly darkened." Here I refer Mr. Maguire to the raising up of the idol shepherd in the church. He objects to my use of the words heresy and schism, but in my opinion he appears to confuse their meaning very much. We all know that the word schism is derived from the Greek, and that it means a splitting.

The apostle, writing to one of the churches, says,—"Let there be no schisms (*scismata*, that is, divisions) among you." Again, the word heresy means, I grant, a choice, but it is when that choice is made with an injury that it becomes wrong; and we find that the word *heresis* is sometimes taken in good sense. Thus, the proper meaning of the latter word, as taken by the church, is a choice of error, as that of *scisma* is a splitting or dividing, as well as a cutting off, as Mr. M. takes it to be. My rev. friend blames me for not proving all at once that the Church of England is the true church in these countries. That I will do; but, if I had the seven heads and ten horns, I could not do it at once, along with following the arguments of Mr. Maguire. He asks me to point out a time when the heresy of the Church of Rome began. Now, to take a simple illustration, if I was to ask any gentleman here, when his hair became grey, would he not be rather surprised at the question? and tell me that it did not happen in one day, but that it became grey by degrees. In the same way, when I am asked when the Church of Rome became corrupted and idolatrous, I answer, by degrees. I shall now refer Mr. Maguire to his favourite apostle, 2d Peter, chap. ii, verse 1, where it is said, "But there where false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." In this text is described, first, the introducers of the heresies and false prophets—secondly, the matter of the heresies, "who *privily* bring in damnable heresies." *Privily*, that is, in the same manner that a man's hair becomes grey by degrees and imperceptibly—and, thirdly, the fatal and awful conclusions to which those heresies must lead,—"they bring upon themselves swift destruction." Mark then, my friends, the manner and the mode of introducing those heresies as pointed out in that text. But we are referred to the Old Testament, and there we have a fine field open to find out what the nature of those heresies, thus described, should be. I will now ask what was the nature of the heresies in the Old Testament, and were they not idolatrous ones? But then they were not a total denying of the Lord; they were, in some measure, made subservient to the worship of the true God. The Jews, in truth, abandoned the true God on those occasions, though they thought themselves, and might have appeared, not to do so. Every part of the Old Testament gives us examples of this fact. Let us read that part in which is described the golden calf that was set up by Aaron: it will be found in the 32d chapter of Exodus, where it is said, when the calf was set up to be worshipped, "These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt." Mark, then, it was intended to represent Eloim himself. Now, this arose from the very sacrificial rites of the Jews, all of which foreshowed the Messiah—it arose from the sacrifices of oxen, misunderstood by those people. Now, is not this the identical thing of which we accuse the Church of Rome? We have the sacrament, and, blessed be God! *we have the real presence with it;* for he who receives it receives Christ, the hope of glory, giving him wealth, and power, and energy; but the elements are not changed into Christ, as the Church of Rome believes, by being transubstantiated into him—hence they get not the real presence, but they receive and adore a fiction instead thereof. Such, my friends, was the apostacy of the Jews; and, if we go over the whole

history of the ancient church, we will find it the same on other occasions. Thus, in the Book of Kings, when the false prophets prophecied to King Ahab, and told him that his enemies would be delivered into his hands, they said at the same time that they served the Lord God, and indicated his will. This was the apostacy of the Church of Rome—the very same as that of the Jews. We find, as the Scriptures describe, the false teachers who were to be in the church, who would close their eyes and ears, and harden their hearts and the hearts of the people against the truth, and against the word of God. Mr. Maguire asks how is it possible that idolatry should exist in the Church of Christ? Now, we find in the 11th chapter of Revelation, were the church is likened to a temple, these words:—"And the angel stood, saying rise and measure the temple of God and the altar, and them that worship therein; but the court that is without the temple leave out, and measure it not, for it is given unto the Gentiles." How then is the truth to be kept alive in the church? Christ has raised witnesses for that purpose:—"I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and three score days, clothed in sackcloth." By means of those will the people be enabled to escape from the midst of the apostacy. Mr. Maguire asked where was the church in the time of Luther?" The true church was in the midst of the abomination—*It was in the heart of a monk.* Luther himself tells us that, when he groaned beneath the burden of sin and laboured in every manner he could to get rid of it, he could find no peace for his soul in the midst of all his prayers and fastings and other austerities. He then mentioned his distress to an Augustinian monk, who, he tells us, discussed for a long time with him the remission of sins, and pointing out to him an article in the creed on that subject, he told him, "Believe this not as if I said in general, but of *thy* sins." Luther then became comforted, and he said he felt that he was washed in the blood of Jesus. Thus there was an humble Augustinian monk in the midst of the apostacy, who was *a silent witness of the truth.*

Mr. Gregg's half hour being then out,

Mr. MAGUIRE—My friends, you have just heard that Luther was a silent witness! I thought quite the contrary, and I never heard of any man who made a greater noise in the world. Why he made more noise than Arius himself; but that is not to the purpose. I asked my opponent where was the true Church in which Luther could make an act of faith, which he must have done under the penalty of damnation? and am I told, where? *De non existentibus et non apparentibus eadem est ratio.* If the Church was not visible, it was just the same for the purpose as if it did not exist at all. Where, again, I ask him, was the Church to be found, if it existed at all? and if it ever had existed, where, when, and how did it disappear? Was there, in reality, after 1500 years, no visible Church on earth? And yet Jesus Christ has said the Church which he established was a city on a mountain, to which all nations flocked—a light which could not be hid—a tree which overshadowed all the earth—a rock against which the gates of hell should not prevail. He said to his Apostles, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and behold I am with you all days to the end of the world." With whom was he?—With the bishops and priests of his Church, to whom he addressed himself. How

was he with them?—Teaching, and preaching, and baptizing. How long?—To the end of time. Again I ask you—but I know that I ask you in vain—where was the Church? Did not the Apostles insert in their creed, "I believe in the holy Catholic Church," as well as they did, "I believe in the Holy Ghost?" How, then, was it Catholic if it was invisible? How was it universal if it was not to be seen on the face of the earth? Thus are those professors of a false creed driven into corners—thus have they recourse to subterfuge, and are put under the necessity of contradicting themselves. I reminded him of Paul and Barnabas, but to no purpose. He says he is for public and private judgment taken conjointly; but he holds that the Dissenters are not in the Church, because, making use of their private judgment, they differ from him.

Mr. GREGG—I protest against Mr. Maguire taking on him the character of a Dissenter.

Mr. MAGUIRE—How can you protest against what all must acknowledge to be a fair argument? But I know, poor man, how you must feel it.

Mr. GREGG—I argue with you as a Catholic gentleman, and if you turn Dissenter, I must take a different course.—(cries of chair, chair).

Mr. MAGUIRE—The chairman will decide that question; but how came it that in my discussion with Mr. Pope that neither Mr. Pope nor I had occasion to resort to interruption or contradiction? But I will argue with you in this way. If two persons, both of whom say they have the Holy Ghost to direct them, should disagree, who is to decide between them? Can the Holy Ghost contradict himself, or will he decide against himself? The Holy Scriptures of themselves cannot be an infallible guide. They are of course objectively infallible, that is with regard to God and to themselves, because all that they contain is true; but they are fallible with regard to us, because we may be deceived in the sense in which we understand them. Now, when any difference exists in matters of religion, before either public or private judgment can decide, by having recourse to the Scripture, it must first determine whether that Scripture be uncorrupted and genuine. And finally, if public and private judgment will not yield to each other, will it be said that the Holy Ghost, whom all pretend to have, is a spirit of contradiction? Mr. Gregg says that he gets out of the dilemma by asserting that private judgment is only right as long as it coincides with that of the Church. Now, I ask who gave his Church any authority in matters of faith? Who ordained it to judge of the faith of Christ? If it derived not that authority from Christ, from whom did it derive it? Was it from Henry VIII., or Bess, or Neddy, or the cruel, avaricious, grasping, tyrannical Somerset? The question to-day is, whether or not the Church of England is the Church of Christ——

Mr. GREGG—In these countries.

Mr. MAGUIRE—In these countries, I say; and it is unnecessary to interrupt me. To-morrow the Church of Rome will be on her trial. I again ask Mr. Gregg, will he support the twenty-two negative and reformed articles of his Church? I do not require of him to prove those which he admits in common with me, and which relate to the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, &c. I challenge him to support the reformed articles of the Church of England, and I will endeavour to keep him to the question. I will now propose a few arguments to him. I say that Church cannot be the true one which accuses Christ of having broken his promises; but the Church of England accuses Christ of having broken his

promises; therefore it cannot be the true Church. I prove the minor proposition thus:—Christ has said that he would build his Church on a rock—that he would make it the pillar and the ground of truth—that the gates of hell would not prevail against it—and that his Spirit would remain with it through all ages, to teach it all truth. But the Protestants say that the Church fell into apostacy and idolatry, and thus that the gates of hell did prevail against it, and, consequently, that the promises of Christ to his Church did fail. Mr. Gregg refers me to the idolatry of the Jews, which I never questioned, to show me that the Church of Christ also fell into idolatry. Christ said to his Church, "As my Father has sent me, so do I send you—and I will remain with you for all ages;" but Mr Gregg says that he did not remain with the Church, and that the object of all those sacred promises fall into the grossest corruption, and abomination, and apostacy. I call on him now to prove the twenty-two articles which he stands here to advocate from Scripture. Every one appeals to the Scripture in support of his own opinions—every heretic, and schismatic, and enthusiast, and ranter, calls the Scripture to his aid; they all say they are infallible in the interpretation of it—that the Holy Spirit dwells in them, and that they feel confident of it; but when they quote the Scripture they give their own gloss to it. I don't give any gloss to the Holy Scripture when I quote it but the gloss and interpretation of that Church which has withstood the tempests of more than 1,800 years, and of those men who adorned it by their wisdom and learning, and holy lives—who studied the Word of God in the sacred cell, and in the rocks of the desert, and who sealed the testimony of its truth with the last drop of blood that flowed from their hearts. It is to the Church of the primitive saints—the Church which converted the whole world—that I appeal; and was it not, in truth, the Church of Rome which converted England and Ireland, and Germany, and many other parts of Europe, to the truths of Christianity? We hear a great deal of the conversion of the Jews by Protestants. I myself heard Mr. Woolfe tell in this room of his having converted a Jewish Rabbin to Christianity; but the truth of the matter was, that when the Jew got the Bible he lost no time until he tore the New Testament out of it. People may laugh when we say that our Church has the gift of miracles; but where is there another Church which could boast like ours of its miracles? Suppose a man should say that he works miracles, and in proof thereof should turn a flock of lambs into an open desert; some of the lambs would be slaughtered by the savage beasts; but when, by their mildness, they should have changed the wolves and tigers, and made them as mild and harmless as themselves, would not that be a great miracle? Such has been our case—we have been sent among the wolves, and we have changed them into the lambs of Jesus Christ. I ask did not St Francis Xavier convert more souls to Christianity in India, during three years and a half, than all that were ever converted in any country by the exertions of the Protestant Church? Even Protestant historians acknowledge the miracles of that great saint; for God knew that when he was sent to carry the Gospel into an infidel country, miracles were necessary to attest the doctrines which he preached. Such conversion was not like that effected by Protestants, who say that when any one reads the Bible, he is converted, whether he may not cast away the Bible in a moment after. To-morrow, my friends, you shall see how I will disprove all the arguments brought against my Church. I will prove that Antichrist is yet to come—that his reign will be but for three years

and a half—that he is to be a single man, and not a whole race of Popes, as Mr. Gregg will attempt to show you. I will prove that that interpretation of the Scripture is nonsensical and ridiculous in the highest degree—I will make Protestants laugh at him for employing it; and now, in my turn, I call upon him to give, as he is bound to do, Scriptural proofs of the reformed part of the Thirty-nine Articles. He believes them to be essential, and that without them there is no safety, for his Church even compels men to swear to them. Now, may it not be asked if the Church had been invisible for one thousand years, could not men do without her still longer? Would she then be like the city on the hill, or that glorious tree which overshadows the entire earth, and in whose wide-spreading branches and ample foliage, the birds of the air find a shelter, and build their nests? and, if the Protestant brethren love to wander and romance, and cannot be brought to nestle among its leaves, then are they of those of whom Christ speaks, when he says, "other sheep and another fold have I, which I must also bring back." Where was the fold and where was the shepherd for a thousand years? Did Jesus leave them so long alone?—Again, I argue thus:—That the church which contradicts the evident truth is false and ignorant. But the Church of England contradicts the evident truth, therefore it is false and ignorant. I prove the minor. The Church of England contradicts the evident truth if it asserts that the part is greater than the whole; but this it does when it holds that private judgment is not only as good, but even better than that of the whole church. Hence I argue that the Church of England is false and ignorant, and I challenge my antagonist to disprove it. Does not Christianity come by hearing, and how by hearing, unless by preaching?—And who sent the ministers of the Church of England to preach? Again do I repeat the question—though I know that I repeat it in vain—where did Luther get his mission? Did you not get baptism from us, and did you not also get the right to preach? What proof have you that you possess that right? According to your own doctrines you cannot have more than a moral probability that you are in the true church; but no act of faith could ever be made on a moral probability. God could never reveal any thing which was only morally probable. In the Church of England there is only a moral probability—therefore, the Church of England cannot be the revealed religion of God. I challenge Mr. Gregg to answer that argument. You can never make an act of faith in a fallible church—you can never build infallibility on fallibility.

Mr. Maguire's half hour ended here.

Mr. GREGG.—I congratulate the people of Ireland that this discussion has taken place. I congratulate them, because I feel assured that, before it shall have terminated, they will be convinced that the Church of Rome is false, and I have undertaken to prove it. Mr. Maguire has just spoken for half an hour, and I am sure that no one here who has heard him understands one word of what he has said. "He darkens counsel with words without meaning." He accuses me of not proving any thing; but it is he who proves nothing. He grapples with his own ideas—he first raises up giants, and then proceeds to kill them. He asserts, that I stand up for private judgment alone; but I stand here a member of the Church of England, and to support its doctrines, as I hope I shall do to the end of my life. I refer to the words of Luther, where, in speaking of private judgment, he says that the right of judgment is impiously

wrested by the pastors from the people. He speaks of the Queen Church, and I say that always existed. I undertake to prove every article of the faith which I support on the Scriptures. Luther says that the church was plunged for ages in idolatry, and I assert *cum intimo animo meo* to that proposition. There are two kinds of universality which are to be distinguished—moral and metaphysical universality. The Church of England claims the former species of universality alone. Mr. Maguire employs an ingenious syllogism to prove that the Church of England contradicts the words of Christ; but, until he divests his mind of mere complicated ideas and becomes more simple, as a follower of the Gospel should, he will not be able to attain the truth. He has told you, my friends, that, according to me, the Church of Christ has been invisible. But here are we a glorious proof of the contrary—here is the united church of England and Ireland, a triumphant demonstration of the visibility of the Church of Christ. I shall now come to the demonstration of my proposition—viz. that the united churches of England and Ireland is the true Church of Christ in these kingdoms. First, they have a fellowship with the apostles; for, although a separate society, they profess the doctrines of the church, and, as the Scriptures shew, it is not necessary for such society to go over to any other. Secondly, I will prove that the doctrines of the Church of England are the doctrines of Christ, and this I will maintain against the whole world. Before I proceed to prove the first part, viz that our church has a fellowship with the apostles—for which purpose I will make use of this book, viz. the Roman Catholic Directory for the year 1837—I will call your attention to this book which I hold in my hand, and which is called the *Pontifical Romanum*. Now, you recollect that Mr. Maguire asked me what nations did we convert? I answer the question very easily. Suppose I say we converted New Zealand, and New Holland, and many nations in the Southern Ocean, do I not give him a sufficient answer? But in this book I find a chapter, *De benedictione Ensis*, the consecration or blessing of the sword; here we have all the solemn rites of a bishop sprinkling holy water—a man kneeling down, and the sword laid on his shoulder—the bishop pronouncing the words, "receive this sword in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to defend our Holy Church from her enemies, &c." This is the way, my friends, in which the Roman Catholics convert nations; it is thus by the sword that they converted the Albigenses—and they converted them with a vengeance, from wolves to lambs; for a million of the persecuted people were extinguished. I hold in my hands two books, namely, a Protestant prayer-book and a Roman missal. Observe this book well, my friends. There is always something curious in things which come from Rome; but this is a very curious book, for you must know that it is one out of which the devil has been driven! I don't wish to offend my Roman Catholic brethren, but I cannot help expressing my firm conviction that the devil is really in this book. I protest not against what good is in the Church of Rome but I protest against her abuses, against her sorceries, her witchcrafts, her driving of the devil out of salt and water, and sticks, and old bones, &c. I do not deny that there is some good in the Church of Rome, and with that I agree, but I condemn her superstition, and idolatry, and apostasies. But to return to my argument. This Roman Catholic Directory contains

lists of bishops; and, by some chance, or that the Lord sometimes blinds men's eyes that good may come from it, it also contains the lists of some Protestant bishops. Mr. Maguire asks me where we got our mission? I answer, from our own primitive bishops it was handed down to us. A very great number of the Catholic bishops were *converted* at the Reformation, and came over to us, and through them was the mission handed down, and my reverend friend well knows that if only one came over in that way it would be sufficient, for St. Paul was but one when he went to convert nations and to ordain pastors.—Here we have a list of the Archbishops of Dublin, I suppose, from the time of St. Patrick; and we find that the last of the Catholic bishops, G. Brown, is the first of the Protestant bishops. He came over to us, just as if Dr. Murray should now cease making holy water, and he was put out of his see by Queen Mary because he was a married man. Now, I wish that my reverend friend was a married man, and, I thank God, that I am one myself; and I don't see why I should be worse in the sight of God because I can prostrate myself on my knees to adore Him, with my wife, and surrounded by my children, whom I teach to adore and worship Him. Well, the next bishop to George Brown was Hugh Cirwan, who was placed in the diocese by the choice of Mary, and in the next line we find him cut off as an apostate and the very second on the list of the Protestant archbishops of Dublin. He renounced the errors of his church, as the greater number of the Catholic bishops did; and I might go on with the whole list, to show you that since that time there has been a regular and uninterrupted chain of bishops of the Church of England in the see, while intervals of centuries occurred in the descent of the Roman Catholic bishops—intervals of confusion and disorder; and while bishops and pastors were foisted over here from Rome to fill the places of those who embraced the reformed doctrines. We have got the regular descent, we have got the cathedrals, and the records and registries, and, I was going to add, the tithes! There is our church emerging gloriously from the corruption of abomination.—[*Here Mr. Gregg again exhibited the roll of paper, which was bedaubed with red and yellow.*] There you see it coming out from the midst of apostacy! We have the bishops—we have the apostolical mission; and we consider that as important, not for any humbug of parade, but as a striking proof of the truth. You all know Paley's argument for the truth of Christianity, drawn from the regular concatination of cotemporary writers; and that argument has the same force here. It is we who have the truth with us; it is we who have come out of Babylon; and do you also, my Catholic brethren, come out from the Babylon of corruption. Take up our prayer books, and you will find them teeming with the purest piety; take up those of your own church, and you will find them full of difficulties and obstacles, and passages which you are desired not to read. You will find in them a St. Agatha, and a St. Martha, and a St. Valentine too—for there was also St. Valentine; and you will find a Dominick, the Grand Inquisitor. Good God, what men to raise to the throne of Christ! What consequences flow from all this corruption? Our country is a degraded nation—their principles are vitiated and lost. Behold Italy a degraded country, and Spain a degraded country, and Portugal, and every other nation, where the religion of Rome prevails, a degraded country. The curse of God has fallen heavy

on them, and they are degraded and debased among the nations of the earth; and then turn your eyes to England, and ask why is she glorious, and prosperous, and triumphant? Why, with Ireland, is she the greatest empire in the world? Because in her the purity of the Christian religion prevails—because no impious or improper prayers are there uttered before the throne of God. Yes, I will proclaim it, from the house-top will I cry it out—my Roman Catholic brethren, come out from Babylon. To-morrow I will take Mr. Maguire on his false miracles—miracles which they themselves do not believe in.

Rev. Mr. Maguire—Fellow Christians, and it is from my heart I call you so, I am not one who erects himself into a court of judicature, and sets himself up to pronounce judgment upon the religious belief of any man—and I do not say that one man is right and another wrong, I have given my reverend opponent a few syllogisms, which I do not wonder at his disliking; they are tough customers. You have a major and a minor proposition, on either of which you may deny, but the consequence you cannot touch, if it be logically and truly deduced. But I will stick to the syllogisms, and I will let him keep to his assertions, at which he seems particularly powerful. He quotes a single text during the whole half-hour—and yet he says, and loudly, that he stands on the Bible. He tells us that the apostles of our Church were the primitive bishops of theirs. I thank him for the admission, and I wish him joy of Bishop Browne and the others whom we turned out of our Church, because they violated a solemn vow to the Almighty. He talks of our celibacy—why, Christ, St. Paul, and St. John were all of the corporation of bachelors; all the rest of the apostles, who had wives, left them upon being called by their Master. All those who have left our Church, on the contrary, have taken wives. Luther, not content with breaking his own vow, made poor Catherine break hers, and gave the Landgrave of Hesse Cassell liberty to marry two wives. He said that we have nothing to do with the ten commandments; the gospel, and nothing else, was all we had anything to do with. My reverend friend has acknowledged that those who were kicked out of our Church, like some of our modern heroes, became the primitive bishops of theirs. Though too bad for us, they were good enough for them. They violated a vow, and it is said that "every man who violates a lawful vow to God has damnation." Yet all those men who acted thus became dignitaries of their Church, without even ordination. They acknowledge our ordination by never ordaining again any priest who goes over to them, while we always ordain anew any who come over to us; and, let me ask, did ever any clergyman of our Church give up his calling and his religion without afterwards debasing himself with the lies and libels he heaped on the one he had left. But this is all talk. It is merely conversational. I will leave him assertion, and I will come to argument. What are the great principles of Christianity? First, that Christ gave a true religion to the Apostles—and, secondly, that they gave it as they received it to the world—thirdly, that this religion has certain marks to induce all to believe in it. What are those marks? Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, and Apostolicity. Our Church has all of those. He has not shown that his has any of them. When I ask him what country his religion has converted, he answers "New Zealand." Why, we have as many missionaries there as they have, and they make more conversions, for they are not satisfied with merely giving men a Bible, and hearing him say God bless you, and no more about it. They

go upon principle. Look at the ancient Christians—see what a trial the convert had to undergo previous to baptism—see the pains that were taken with him, and the instruction he received. Read St. Augustin. *De civitate Dei*, and others of his works, and compare our manner of making converts with the method adopted with regard to the New Zealand converts by them. I will now proceed. He talked of Luther. I said before that Luther had not maintained the doctrine of public judgment. Well, Mr. Gregg quotes from him a passage to the effect that the hearers are the judges. Is it *censu composito* or *censu diviso?* Is it all the hearers that are the judges? Then all must be united among themselves; if only each single hearer, then that is the right of private judgment, and that right Luther maintained. I asked him whether the Holy Ghost gave private or public judgment, or both. If the first, then private judgment was infallible; if the second, then it was infallible, and weighed down the individual judgment; if both, who is to decide between them if they differ? He admits no private judgment, unless it accords with the public. But if it differ, who is to decide? With regard to the non-existence of the Church for 800 years, he spoke of universality, moral and metaphysical. Mind the words of the Church of England are, that there was no individual, young or old, clergy or laity, that was not buried in idolatry for 800 years. I called on him to show me the lawfulness of his mission; he did not do so. I called on him to show me that one link in the chain of bishops of his church was unbroken; he did *not* do so. I saw him hesitating and staggering, when endeavouring to explain the fact of the rejected bishops of our Church becoming the bishops of his. With regard to the twenty-two negative articles of the Church of England, he made a great flourish. He said he would prove them all from Scripture; but he became appalled, and did not attempt to prove one of them. He quit the subject as a child would run away from a mad dog. Why did he not prove some of those reformed articles which his Church compels all its members to swear to? I call on him to do so now; but I'll hear as little of it as you will. Again he talks of the consecration of chapels, and of the consecration of a sword. My answer to him is, wait till the coronation comes, and you will see how they will bless the Queen's shawl, and her dimity, and her crown, and pray that she may go on and prosper and have a happy reign. Now, I will prove the lawfulness of that practice, to which my reverend friend objected from Scripture. I refer you to the 19th chapter of Numbers, where, to cure the bite of a dog, water and clay were blessed and sprinkled on the wound. Again, I refer you to St. Paul, who says, "For every creature of God is good when sanctified by the word of God and prayer." We bless the marriage-bed to give a sanctifying influence to the connubial state. But, not to lose time, do you not consecrate your own Churches and altars? My reverend friend spoke of the abuses of our religion, as he was pleased to call them, and argued against it on account of them. Our blessed Saviour chose twelve Apostles to represent him. One betrayed, another denied, and the rest fled from him. From this the Jew, the Pagan, or the infidel would have a better argument against Christianity than he has against us, from all the abuses he has enumerated. But, viewing them in their most favourable light, they prove nothing. He argues from particulars to generals, and, *a particulari ad generalum non valid conscientio.* He talked of the persecutions perpetrated by our Church. I ask him when did she ever approve of the principle? It is true that when in

alliance with the state her children have persecuted; but then it was never approved of by the Church, being always caused by what is called state policy. Remember that I need not say to-day a single word in defence of the Roman Catholic Church. He has travelled out of his record; and I, because I wish to be all things to all, have followed him. But I will now bring him back to the point. He says there is a public judgment in his Church. I ask him is that judgment infallible, or is it a hit-or-miss judgment? If he says that she is not infallible, I ask him will Jesus Christ bind us to obey a Church which is just as fallible as ourselves? And is not that Church better in proof of whose infallibility no less than 136 texts can be quoted? I ask where were the Holy Scriptures for the sixty years after Christ died? The Church existed, teaching, preaching, and baptizing; yet the first of the Scriptures were not written until thirty years after the Redeemer's death, nor was St. John's Gospel written until sixty-five years after the event. And yet, was not the Church visible and flourishing at the time? If Christ was with his Church then, is he not with her now?—or did he say to his apostles, the nearer you are to me the more you need me; and the more you require me the more I will abandon you? I have asked Mr. Gregg how he got the Bible, or how he knows it to be true, or how he will prove the divinity of the Apocalypse? He has not answered the first two questions; and the third will be before you to-morrow. I will now give him a syllogism—that is not the Church of Christ, which cannot on Christian principles prove the divinity of the Scriptures, but the Church of England cannot, on Christian principles, prove the divinity of the Scriptures; therefore the Church of England is not the Church of Christ. I prove my minor—the Church of England denies tradition, and holds that there is nothing except the Scriptures that is not fallible. That cannot be proved by my opponent without falling into a vicious circle, to wit—to prove that the Scriptures are infallible or divine he must beg the question—namely, that they are true. We both agree to the divinity of the Scriptures. But I have reason for entertaining that belief—he has more; but for that I would not have asked him to prove the fact he assumes.

SECOND DAY.

WEDNESDAY, May 30th, 1838.

Wednesday being the second day of the discussion, it was resumed at the appointed hour. The room was much more densely crowded than on the preceding day. At eleven o'clock precisely,

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE rose and said,—my Christian brethren, the Church of England is this day on her trial, and I am to accuse her. I did not take all this trouble for the purpose of attacking my reverend and respected friend; but I came here to attack the church to which he belongs, and through him to expose her heresy and schism. The Church of England is arraigned this day before the tribunal of public opinion. She shall be weighed in the balance of the Holy Scriptures, and shall be found miserably wanting. You, my brethren, will please to observe,

that when an antagonist is detected in a fundamental error, he is bound by the laws of truth and of religion to relinquish all further opposition. Now, I think I will prove to your satisfaction, and the satisfaction of the rev. gentleman himself, that he has fallen into a very great error; and if I do, I hope he will at once acknowledge it and come over to our side. The Rev. Mr. Gregg has asserted, that the true, holy, Catholic Church was invisible for eight hundred years or more. Now St. Paul says, in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 4th chapter and 3d verse, "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost." The meaning of this is clear from the next verse: "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine into them." It signifies that the gospel of Jesus was to be preached everywhere, and the glory of his religion was everywhere to be announced, so that the truth of it would become so palpable and obvious, that only those who were sunk in eternal perdition, and who could not, because they would not, see, would avoid beholding it. Now I want him to reconcile his assertion to this saying of St. Paul, and I defy him to do so. It is impossible. But I will go further. I never promise to prove anything without doing so; and I now undertake to prove, to a perfect demonstration, the absolute perpetual visibility and indefectibility of the holy Catholic Church, and if, then, the holy Catholic Church does possess a never-ending visibility and indefectibility, his Church cannot be it, for he admits that it was invisible for eight hundred years or more.—Now, gentlemen, mark my proof. Let me, my Protestant brethren, call your attention particularly to this. I am now about to quote from the prophets in support of my proposition. You may, perhaps, say that all the prophesies which I will cite relate to the Jewish Church alone. But I deny this; and I will prove to you from the New Testament that they refer to the Christian Church, and to Christ who was the son of David. I refer you to the 1st chapter and 1st verse of the gospel of Matthew—"The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." This, then, proves that Jesus Christ was the son of David and of Abraham, and that the promises made in the name of David referred to him. But I will go further; I will refer you to the 1st chapter of the gospel by Luke, beginning at the 30th verse—"And the angel said unto her, fear not, Mary, for thou has found favour with God; and behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shall call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father, David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Now, these quotations show to whom the texts I shall subsequently quote must refer. You will also perceive that these promises could not refer to the Jews; for St. Paul says, "The new Church is established upon far better promises than the old." If, then, I prove that the Church could not be invisible, and that it could never fail and become apostate, I will succeed in proving that my reverend friend has fallen into a fundamental error. I now proceed with my demonstration. I refer you to the 34th verse of the 89th psalm—"My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that has gone out of my lips. Once I have sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven."

Again (27th verse), "Also, I will make him my first born, higher than the kings of the earth." Now, you will bear in mind that the Bible I am reading from is not the Douay Bible, but the authorised version published in the reign of James the First, by command of the king. But to come once more to my texts. What does Saint Paul say? "The children of the promise account for the seed." Again, look to the 72d psalm—"They shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure throughout all generations. He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth." That cannot refer to the Jews; for their kingdom did not extend from sea to sea. Again, "All kings shall fall down before him—all nations shall serve him." I now refer you to the 48th chapter, and 14th verse of Isaiah, "The Lord hath loved him; he he will do his pleasure on Babylon, and his arm shall be on the Chaldeans." Now, let me ask my reverend friend, what Church, for the fifteen hundred years previous to Elizabeth, ever taught the Thirty-nine Articles? Let me ask, for the eight hundred years, during which he says there was no one who was not sunk in some damnable idolatry, where were the watchmen that were to keep watch on the walls of Jerusalem? Did not Christ say to his Church—"Thou shalt be the city sought for and not forsaken." Where, let me ask, was it to be sought for during the period referred to, and where was it to be found? Again, Isaiah says—and I beg of you to remark this, my brethren, that they are afraid to translate the names mentioned in the passage, giving them in the old Greek form. Isaiah then promises that the Church shall spread through Italy, Spain, Portugal, and France, and "to the isles afar off," and these islands are England, Ireland, and Scotland, which were called the islands afar off, because they were considered the most distant parts of the west previous to the discovery of America. Isaiah adds—"I will take of them to be priests and Levites;" and Jeremiah says—"I will give fear to their hearts, that they may not revolt from me." But, according to my reverend friend, these promises were all lies; for they did revolt from him, and their revolt continued for eight hundred years. Thus Christ has prophesied that he would leave after him a visible successor to himself on the throne of the Church, and that none should ever be wanted, and that there should always be a priest in the new law, to offer sacrifice from the rising to the setting of the sun. Here I have Hezekiah upon the point—"And he will raise up over them one pastor." Thus Christ is the one pastor, and he has left his visible vicegerent upon the earth. The same prophet prophesies also that there never shall be idolatry in the new Church. I wish my reverend friend would tell me how many pastors there are in the Church of England? The Queen is the present pastor—God knows who will be the next! The Lord has said that his kingdom will endure for ever—that is, that all heresies shall yield to the true Church. The heresies of Luther, of Knox, of Calvin, and of Zuinglius, even as the heresy of Arius and other heresies, yielded to it before. Let me ask what Lutheranism is now to what Arianism was, when it could number within its pale fully 3,000 bishops? And where is Arianism now? The true church has triumphed over it, and it will equally triumph over Lutheranism; but not by the sword, as my opponent has insinuated. Oh! if he recollected the penal laws—if he recollected all the money and the blood which had been wrung from this country alone—if he remembered how England was proselytized by the plunder and persecution and robbery which were practised—the seizure

of churches too, for they never built one cathedral of their own,—he never would have been so imprudent as to speak of our Church using the sword or stretching forth the hand of violence. I should fatigue you if I were to give you all the texts which bear upon the proposition I have undertaken to prove. But having given you so many from the Old Testament, I shall now give you one or two from the New. You will find there that Christ said that his Church was a city built upon a mountain, and that it should never be hid; but my reverend friend says that it has been hid, and hid for the space of eight hundred years or more. I leave it to himself to reconcile his assertion with the promise of Our Saviour. I think I have now proved the perfect visibility and indefectibility of the true Church. My friend admits that at one time our Church was the true Church; but he says that it afterwards apostatized. But I have proved that it could not apostatize. I have adduced the promises of Christ himself in support of my proposition; and I therefore call upon him to retrace his steps, and acknowledge his error. But, if he does not do so, I call upon him to name a single Church that ever professed belief of the thirty-nine articles previous to the days of Elizabeth. I challenge him to prove the truth of the twenty-two negative articles, and he must give me Scripture also; for I take him at his own word, that there is nothing infallible except the Scriptures. Now, my Protestant brethren, I take up your book of Common Prayer, and look at the 14th psalm. You will see that there it contains eleven verses; look to the Bible, and you will find but seven verses. Either then you have subtracted from the word of God in the Bible, or you have added to it in the Book of Common Prayer. Now, there is not a single one of your bishops who has not sworn to the truth of every word in that Book of Common Prayer; and I say there is not one of them that has not committed perjury. Next, you exclude from the Scriptures the Book of Tobit, and the Second Book of Machabees, because it recommends prayers for the dead. Luther excluded the Apocalypse, and the second epistle of Saint Peter, and the epistle of Saint James—the latter because it was in favour of good works. Now, I ask you on what principle you deny the canonicity of these books, or on what principle you can prove the inspiration of any book in the Bible? I challenge you to prove that the Book of Revelations is inspired. You may say to me—why, you admit the book yourself, and why do you ask me to prove it? I answer, that I admit the book on the infallible authority of Christ and his Church, and on the authority of tradition. You deny the authority of tradition, and refuse to admit the infallible authority of the Church; and I will try on what principle you admit the canonicity of the book in question. Thus, then, my friends, stands the case, as far as Protestantism is concerned. I have proved that it is not the true Church. It may have the power and the pelf; but even that may be only for a time. And, for my own part, I would say, conscious that we may all soon die, "What is the whole world to a man if he should lose his own soul."

Rev. Mr. GREGG—My friends, the Rev. Mr. Maguire has been arguing this last half-hour in the exercise of a vicious sophism, which in the schools is known by the name of an argument *a dicto secundum quid, a dictum simpliciter*—that is, arguing from a thing taken in a certain sense to a thing taken absolutely. You know that a thing may be true in one sense that is not true in another. And that is just the error which the Rev. Mr. Maguire has committed. That very sophism is the one which

has been the cause of the apostacy and overthrow of his Church. Saint Paul says, "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." If I were to take the letter of the Bible, I might make it support doctrines most false and heretical. Now, let me give you one instance of this, and I will not have to go far for it. You will find it in the 1st chapter of Genesis—"And God said, behold I have given you every herb bearing seed which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed—to you it shall be for meat." The infidel or the Pagan may take up this text and say it was most unjust for God to punish the whole world for the first man having eaten the forbidden fruit, when in this text he gave them liberty to eat all fruit. Now, mark me, it is true in one sense that the Church was visible during the eight hundred years previous to the reformation. It is true, in another sense, that it was invisible. Now give me leave to illustrate this for you. Suppose a large corn field, in which tares and poppies spring up along with the wheat—and the scarlet colour of the weed is most appropriate—at a distance the whole field will appear scarlet; but when you examine more closely you will discover the wheat. Now I claim visibility, Apostolicity, Catholicity, the absence of idolatry, and of such superstitious practices as the blessing of water, and of clay, and of dead men's bones, as among the glories of Christ's everlasting Church. I admit that the Church was almost invisible; but still it existed. And now let me explain to you the nature of the mistake into which my reverend friend has fallen. I grant him the correctness of every one of the texts he has quoted; but still I think he is wrong in saying he took them from our Bible.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I quoted them from the Bible which was published by the King's authority in the reign of James the First.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—That is not the authorised version.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I hold that it is.

Mr. GREGG—It is not our version. The word holocaust does not occur in the entire of our version, and it occurs in that. Now, my friends, he talks about our use of Greek words. But there is a word which does not occur in the whole of our Bible, but which is retained in the Douay for the purpose of mystification, I refer you to the 49th chapter and 26th verse of Genesis—"The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors, unto the utmost bounds of the everlasting hills. They shall be on the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of him that was separate from his brethren." This was a promise; and there are several other similar promises which are true only *secundum quid;* so it is with regard to the visibility and perpetuity of the Church, which are perfectly consistent with the apostacy which, I say, is foretold in the Book of Revelations. In the Old Testament we find Elijah saying, "Behold I am alone in the worship of the true God," when at that time there were 7,000 knees that never bent to Baal, and three hundred prophets hid in caves. There then was the Church invisible, and our Church was similarly situated; for though our numbers were few, there were always some who maintained the truth as it is in Jesus. Now, my dear Sir, pardon me, but I must express my wish for your conversion, and I believe that it will take place. Let me show you one text which you have greatly misunderstood, and the proper understanding of which lies at the foundation of the salvation of the soul of man. And, Gentlemen, this is not the only text which he would fail in explaining. There is not a single similar text in the whole Scripture which he could possibly understand. He could not—I

defy him; and no man can that is not taught by the living spirit. The text to which I allude will be found in the 2d and 3d verses of the 4th chapter of the second Epistle to the Corinthians—"But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty—not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully"—and woe be to them who do handle it deceitfully, and I charge the Romish Church with doing so—"but by manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost." Mr. Maguire explained this as signifying that the Christian doctrine and Church should be so easily discovered that only the wilfully blind could avoid seeing it; whereas it has no more reference to the visibility of the Church than it has to St. Peter's at Rome, or St. Paul's in London. My rev. friend wants to have it implied that I had admitted that the gates of hell had prevailed against the Church. I admitted no such thing. I merely say that the Scripture fortels the apostacy that came upon the Church, and I assert that during that apostacy the Church ceased to be gloriously visible. I do not bring forward one but a hundred texts to bear me out in my position. I refer you to the 11th chapter of Revelations, 2d verse—"And the holy city shall they tread under foot, forty and two months; and I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and three score days, clothed in sackcloth." Here, then, we have two single witnesses who were to show forth the truth amongst the Gentiles, and to continue the Church. Thus when I say the Church was invisible, I said in a certain sense, and not absolutely. Suppose the case of two wrestlers:—One gets the other down on his knees or haunches, the other struggles on, rises again, and overthrows his antagonist. Would any one in that case say that the wrestler who was thrown on his knees was overcome? That is precisely the way with the true Church. Besides, at the very time of the apostles, there sprang up many other churches, besides that one which was established by Christ himself, and we read of one of them which has continued even from that time down to the present, still maintaining the doctrines taught by our Saviour. I hold in my hand a work written by a clergyman, it is Buchanan's Christian Researches in Asia," in which he gives a description of the Syrian Church, which has subsisted ever since its foundation by St. Thomas the apostle, and which complained very much of the violence of the Roman Catholic Church in establishing the inquisition at Goa. Thus the Church is invisible in one sense and visible in another. And so it is in this very moment, spiritually speaking, in the Church of England. There are some who are truly converted to God, and truly impregnated with the spirit of the Holy Ghost, and those are not visible though there are many such—the others, who are not so thoroughly converted to God, are visible—the former invisible because they have nothing to distinguish them from the ordinary members of the Church, as they wear no blessed stole or garments of peculiar shape. The rev. gentleman has alluded to the penal code. It would have been better for him not to have done so; for let me ask him from whom that penal code came—with whom did persecution originate? Come, answer me that. It came from the mother of abominations. I grant that you and I admit that our Church did persecute, but from whom did she learn the lesson, under what act of parliament did the persecution commence? Under an act of parliament passed in the reign of Henry the Fourth, a Popish king; and that statute enacted that any bishop—one of those that

blessed the sword, and the clay, and the water—might condemn any heretic. Mr. Maguire mocks at me about the Bible. "You come," he says, "with the Bible, and you put it into the hands of those you wish to convert, and then you are satisfied." But you, I say, come with the sword, and you make those whom you visit as tame as lambs. Henry the Fourth, you all know, reigned in the year 1339, two hundred years before Luther's time, and he passed a law that any bishop could convict any subject of heresy; and in case of his not abjuring, or of his falling back after abjuration, he could order the sheriff to conduct him to the flames, which order should be immediately obeyed. That is the statute under which persecution commenced; and it, you perceive, was enacted in a Popish reign. I admit that the texts which my reverend friend quoted have reference to the glory and perpetuity of the Church, and that they are perfectly true in one sense, and the more especially when the Church has come out from the midst of Babylon. For this one thing I tell you—the great check to the progress of the true religion is the Romish Church. The Rev. Mr. Maguire alluded to the cathedrals and houses of prayer, which were built by bachelors. It is true we have them, and we will have those which they are now building, not that we will take them from them by force, but that they will come over to us as they did before. But while they are building their Churches we are building another, and a spiritual cathedral, the stones of which are living stones, and which shall for ever endure. View the labours of our missionaries, spreading on every side, and disseminating the truth through all quarters of the earth. Yet these are the married parsons at whom my friend sneers. But, my Roman Catholic brethren, I do not want to disparage——

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—My friends, I put it to you, did the Rev. Mr. Gregg, during the last half hour, answer a single one of the many questions which I put to him? Did you hear one single word about the thirty-nine articles? Did he tell you of a single Church, from the days of Christ to the days of Elizabeth, who also belonged to the corporation of bachelors? I wanted to know where was the reformed Church for eight hundred years. He told you that it was visible and invisible; and then, in explaining the text which I quoted from St. Paul, to prove that it could not be invisible, he spoke of *dictum secundum quid* and *dictum simpliciter*—so that every poor Protestant who does not know the meaning of this *dictum secundum quid* must be damned. He talked to you of sophisms and sophistry; but if I were to evade one hundred texts quoted against me by *dictum secundum quid* and *dictum simpliciter*, he would loudly cry out against me for my trickery, and stamp in indignation at my conduct. He says that no man can know the Scriptures without the grace of God. Who ever denied it? But where is the grace and the spirit of God to be found? What will he say to the Unitarians, the Quakers, the Presbyterians, and the Wesleyans, all of whom claim the spirit? What will he say to the Quakers? The Quakers have a far better claim, one would think, to the possession of the spirit than he or his Church. Let him answer those questions. I thank my rev. friend for his good opinion of my understanding. I thank him for his rash judgment. The Scripture says, "judge not, that you may not be judged." I do not pronounce any judgment on Mr. Gregg. I confess that I am a sinner. Mr. Gregg tells you that he has the spirit of God. You may, Sir, have as much or more of the private spirit; but it is impossible for a man to know it himself. Christ said to his apostles—"I have yet many

things to tell you, which you could not bear, but when I am gone I will send down the Holy Spirit, and he will teach you many things." He endeavoured to explain the saying of St. Paul—"But if our gospel be lost, it is to them that are lost." But still he did not shake my interpretation, nor weaken the force of a single one of the texts which I quoted to support it. The true gospel, then, is only to be found in the true Church, and Christ says—"He that believeth not shall be condemned," and "He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me." This was plainly telling where the gospel was to be found. My friend admits that the gospel was with us once. I have proved that it could not have left us. He has not contravened my proofs. Besides, as I have often said before, we have not heard a single word from him about the Thirty-nine Articles. After all I have said, he has not attempted to prove a single one of the twenty-two negative articles. With regard to the visibility of the Church, he talks to us of Mr. Buchanan and the Syrian Church. What business have I taking Mr. Buchanan's word for what he says he saw. *Gratus asseritur*—it is a gratuitous assertion—I don't believe a single word. Besides he does not show that the Syrian Church, on which he so much relies, professes one single doctrine in accordance with his own Church. Let him prove to me that the Syrian Church denies the supreme authority of the head of the Church, or that it professes its belief in the Thirty-nine Articles, and it will go to prove something for him; but until then the existence of such a Church is of no consequence to him or me. Christ said to Peter—"Peter loveth thou me," and Peter answered, "Lord, thou knowest all things—thou knowest that I love thee;" and then Christ said, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep;" that is, he placed him over his Church, both clergy and laity; and Peter's successors have ever since filled the throne of that Church. Now, during the 1,500 years that Christ's vicegerents sat on the throne and the Church flourished, where was the Church of England? Oh, it existed, he says, both visibly and invisibly; and to prove that it existed he mentions some priest named Soter that was burned in the reign of Henry IV., just as if every one that was burned was a Protestant. Why he might as well say that every widow that was burned in India during that period was a Protestant on account of her having been burned. He says that our Church converted nations by the sword. I ask, was it by the sword that Boniface converted France? Was it by the sword Austin converted England—St. Patrick, Ireland -and was it by the sword that Xavier converted India? He admits that his Church persecuted, I deny that ours did; though I admit that Catholics persecuted, and by persecuting proved themselves unworthy members of the Church to which they belonged. We abominate the persecuting many. But I never yet heard a Protestant reprobate Elizabeth, who persecuted more in one year than Mary did during her whole reign. Does he recollect the case of Jenkins, the bookseller? He may read it in Baker and other writers. When he was tried and sentenced to be nailed to a wall by his ears and not to be cut down till he cut off his ears with his own hand, the Lord suffered a plague to break out on the spot, and judge and jury, and witnesses, were struck dead in the court, and 15,000 individuals were carried off by the visitation. But what was most remarkable, even the haughty Elizabeth was so appalled by the judgment that she never had courage to carry the sentence into operation. But no more about abuses, for they are no argument against the Church in which they exist, or have

existed. Any one may err, but the error he commits will prove nothing. I ask not to charge his Church with abuses. I demand principles—I asked him could he prove on principle the canonicity of one single book of the holy Scriptures. Did he give an answer? I ask now is not his religion that which confirms in their heresies the Unitarians, the Baptists, and all othes heretics. Was it not his religion which first broached the doctrine of the right of private judgment, and is it not in the exercise of that right that the Unitarians maintain their heresy? I condemn, I anathematize, I abominate their doctrine as much as he, though I do not condemn themselves. But I tell him, the Unitarians are more consistent than he, for they assert the right of private judgment, and at once deny the divinity of the Son of God. I say it was his abominable lying Church which created this heresy, and which set all the world mad that assented to its doctrine. My reverend friend talked of promises to Joseph, but that promise related to the Church of Christ, and was prophetical, signifying that it should last for ever. There was nothing, therefore, in the argument which he founded upon that. He says if it was strictly taken, that it would go to support heresy. I do take it strictly, for I take it according to the direction of St. Paul. He says that his Church is the Catholic Church in this kingdom. I ask him, in what other kingdom it is Catholic? Again he tells us, and it is the only middling argument that he has made use of since the commencement of this discussion, that Isaiah said, "even I only am a prophet of the Lord," and that therefore the Church was invisible. It is true he put it lamely enough, but then I will put it better for him. There was in the world at this time but the Jewish Church. It was invisible, and if the Church could be invisible under the old law, it could also be invisible under the new law. I think that is putting his argument as strongly as possible, and I am rejoiced to have anything in the shape of argument to answer. It is the first he has yet given me, and I will now answer it. When he gave us the text he did not give us the context. And if he looked a littte lower down he would find that not only were there 7,000 knees that never bent to Baal, but he would find in the Prophet Ahab that there were 300 other prophets concealing themselves in caves from the persecution that was raging at the time. How then could the Jewish Church be invisible? Besides, where was then the entire of Israel which professed the same religion? If he looked to the 1st chapter of the 1st book of Kings, he would find that the small tribe of Benjamin alone sent to Rohoboam no less than one hundred and four score thousand chosen fighting men. What, then must have been the numbers of the other tribes, and with so many, how could the Church be invisible? So much for his infallible interpretation of the Scriptures. Now, I will tell you what is the proper meaning of the text. When the prophet said that he was alone, he meant that he alone stood out against the persecution, and that while the other prophets fled from the persecution, he alone boldly reproved the King, and represented to him what would be the consequences of his crimes. This hiding of the prophets was not blameable, for even by the example of Christ himself, who fled when the people sought to stone him, we find that it is not wrong to avoid persecution. The martyrs avoided it, but when they were obliged to undergo it, they willingly and boldly gave up

their lives as a sacrifice for their faith.—Now, I have answered the only tangible objection which he has given me to answer, and I ask how has he defended himself? To-morrow I will be on my defence; to-day it is my business to attack; and having charged him with heresy and schism —having called on him to give his reason for believing in the Thirty-nine Articles which his Church obliges every one connected with it to swear to—how did he answer? What nonsense to require men to swear to theological opinions. How can any one with a safe conscience swear that the mass is damnable. How can any one swear to what it is impossible to prove true? My friend knows that Luther first objected to the mass, and that it was the devil that advised him to it. Luther himself admits that the devil, in five arguments, persuaded him to deny the mass, and he has even related carefully those five arguments. I would ask, how would that great dignitary, Exeter, defend himself from the charge of perjury, especially when he knows that three things are requisite to perjury—judgment, truth, and justice? I do not say that he does not believe what he swears; but I say that he swears it rashly, and without having reason to believe what he swears. But from my reverend friend we have not heard a word about these articles.—They are indefensible, and he does not attempt to defend them. I asked him could he convert a Jew? I quoted texts which the Jew might use against him, to show that there could be no idolatry in the Church of Christ; whereas he says it was buried in idolatry. The Jew would say, "If the Church be established by God, how can you get out of this? You say that for 800 years the Church was buried in idolatry as far as could be seen. The prophecies tell me that the Church should last for ever, even to the end of the world. Christ, according to your Testament, said the same, and that it should be a city built upon a mountain, and that the Holy Spirit should be with it for ever. According to you he has broken his word, and therefore he is not God. Besides your statement, if true, contradicts the prophets. I therefore reject your religion." To this his answer was that one fact was worth a thousand arguments, and that his Church had converted a Jew. The fact of the conversion of a Jew does not controvert my proposition, which was, that it could not convert a Jew consistently with its own doctrine and belief. Well, I repeat it again. Oh, then he talks of wrestling. Suppose two men wrestling; suppose it was foretold of one of them——

The half hour here terminated.

Just at this moment a gentlemen connected with the press wanted to get a seat at the table allotted for the reporters, but it was so crowded by persons not connected with the press that he found it impossible. Accordingly he wrote up to the Chairmen, and

The Rev. Mr. M'Namara came forward and directed the table to be cleared of all those not connected with the press.

The persons who occupied the table hesitated, and did not comply at once.

Rev. Mr. M'Namara—I insist upon every one not belonging to the press leaving the table. It was allotted to the reporters, and I will take care that it shall be preserved for them.

Mr. Nolan (ex-priest)—You are delaying the time; it is not right.

Rev. Mr. M'Namara—I am doing my duty, Sir. Mr. Gregg has a

chairman, who will take care he shall have fair play. For my part I won't allow the reporters to be incommoded.

The table having been cleared, and order restored, the discussion went on.

Rev. Mr. Gregg—I dare say, my friends, you have all heard of an eccentric clergyman belonging to our Church, named Rowland Hill. He was, I believe, a little light at one side of his head. Well, at one time a stange clergyman preached in his church, and his preaching was rather in the country style. After a wild discourse he said, "Well, I have been rambling about for half an hour, but I know you wish to ramble," and here the story ended. Mr. Hill then rose up and said, "this gentleman will ramble with you again this evening." This story just applies to my rev. friend. For I never heard so rambling a speech as he has given you for the last half hour, and I believe I may announce that he will ramble with you again the next half hour. Now, my Roman Catholic brethren, did I not give him a fine beautiful system, and instead of contravening it, has he not given us a rambling discourse? First, he gave me the thirty-nine articles—I am going to answer the question on that point. Next, he gave us a list of heretics, and I must say that I never heard any Roman Catholic clergyman arguing that did not father all the heresies in the world. Next he gave us the shepherd and the lambs, Luther and the Devil; Jenkins, Xavier, the marriage of priests, the thirty-nine articles again, and finally 100,000 fighting men. He says that Luther said he was alone for 1,000 years. I say he said that, in a certain sense, just as it was said by the prophet Elijah. That my friend is blind in this particular is ascribable to Popery. I hope he will excuse me for calling it by the name, as he has designated our Church by the most opprobrious epithets. Now, I will prove that a single erroneous idea will affect the mind so as to render it impossible for it to judge rightly on any subject. Suppose a man take it into his head that he is a house-clock, he will go into the corner and wag his hands to and fro, and when his friends would remonstrate with him he would say that he was minding his business. So it is with my friend. But I will stand by the articles of my Church, and prove that they are the truth, as it is in Jesus, when the time comes. I will give him a system, a whole view, which I defy him to upset. But I come now to the thirty-nine articles. Here are what he calls the negative articles. They are those from the sixth to the thirty-eighth. He says that it is impossible to prove a negative, and he alarms with his rule of logic. I allow that in some instances it is impossible, but in matters of religion God allows us to see matters plainly, and then a negative can be proved. There is also another axiom in logic which I only partly admit, and that is, *a particulari ad generalem non valet consecutio.* That axiom is only relatively true. The first is a good axiom for general use, for it supersedes the necessity of any one proving the negative of a set of assertions which might be advanced by an antagonist. If that were necessary, a discussion would be endless. But in religion negatives may be maintained. For instance—"Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven image" is a strong negative, but it cannot be denied, and requires not logical demonstration. Now, to come to the other axiom. That, too, is valuable in some respects, but it is not valid in scriptural or religious

matters. For instance, from the care that God took in drawing his servant Joseph out of danger, I might argue the general care which he takes of all his children. To come now to the first of what he calls the negative articles—it is this :—"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary for salvation : so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or thought necessary or requisite to salvation. In the name of the holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church." Here follows the list of the books, and then "all the books of the New Testament as they are commonly received, we do receive and account them as canonical!" Now I will prove from Isaiah, and from Deuteronomy, the truth of this article. In the 4th chapter and 2nd verse of Deuteronomy you will find, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you; neither shall you diminish aught from it, that you may keep the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you." From these texts I think I have proved the sixth article; and I shall be equally fortunate with the rest. He talks of our not being able to convert a Jew. I hold in my hand the Douay Bible, and from it may be derived by the Jew a fine argument for not adopting Christianity on account of the Apochrypha being included in it. Now, remember, I speak to him as a priest, and not as a Unitarian or any other heretic—if so I may call them. I will not allow him to become a Unitarian. Now, Roman Catholic brethren, I call on you to come back to your ancient and holy bishops. I tell you that the prohibition to marry is a cruel and damnable restraint. It is wrong to keep men from the holy energy attendant on matrimony. Oh, blessed be God for holy matrimony. Mark me—I do not blame those that do not marry. I knew several excellent clergymen of my own Church who lived in singleness; but they did not meddle with married people; they did not seek to pry into things about which they knew nothing, or to ask questions which it would be impossible to repeat. It is nonsense to say that the words "lambs and sheep" in the text, which my friend quoted, signify the clergy and laity. If the lambs be the laity, when they grow up to sheep's estate they must become priests, and then we would have all the laity becoming priests. Besides there are more things than lambs and sheep in the fold, namely, the shepherd, and the wolf in sheep's clothing. It would also be nonsense to take a sheep or a ram from among the flock, to make it a shepherd. Now I will come to the next of the negative articles of my faith. "The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only mediator between God and man, being both God and man, wherefore they are not to be heard, which feigns the old fathers did look only for transitory promises, although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rights, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet, notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral." Now that is the seventh article, and I think you will agree with me that it requires but little demonstration. However, I prove it from the 1st chap-

ter and 1st verse of the Epistle of the Hebrews—"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake unto the fathers in times past." If then it was only the one God spoke, he could not contradict himself, and therefore the Old and New Testament do not differ. With the rest of the article I need not trouble myself.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—My friend has told me that he will not permit me to be an Unitarian, I never have been an Unitarian, and I don't think it likely I ever shall be one (laughter). But I use the argument, because he agrees with the Unitarian in his rule of faith, by admitting private judgment. The early reformers fixed the rule of faith to be judgment and conscience, and Mr. Gregg agrees with them. Now, I ask him, can an Unitarian be saved by that rule? I may be rambling in Mr. Gregg's opinion, but I am about to come to a conclusion from the premises which I have established; and it is, that his Church has made the Unitarians. I charge her with it, and let him disprove it if he can. I will get no answer, but you will weigh his motives for overlooking it. Now, he talks of the Jews, and says he can convince them by putting the Bible into their hands, and telling them it is the book of the Lord Jesus. He will tell them truth, but will the Jews believe him? He tells us the Spirit of God will direct them; but what is that but appealing to individual inspiration? Will not the Unitarian, and Presbyterian, and Quaker lay claim to equal inspiration? And yet Mr. Gregg's favourite Thirty-nine Articles say, cursed be he that saith that a man can be saved in any faith if he conform thereto. Again, he compares Luther to the prophet Isaiah. The prophet said, "I of the prophets was the only prophet that stood up;" and because Luther said he stood alone, therefore he was, in the eyes of Mr. Gregg, equal to Isaiah. But Isaiah had never said he stood alone. He said he was the only one of the prophets who stood openly forward to bear the brunt of persecution, while the rest were concealed in caves. Mr. Gregg chooses to be witty upon my allusion to the one hundred thousand men; but I quoted it from the holy Scriptures, and I do not think it a very proper subject for the reverend gentleman's jokes. He says, one error is ruinous. I admit, one error of faith is ruinous; but believing a man a house-clock, which my reverend friend quoted as an illustration, is not an error of faith (laughter). The cause why a single error of faith is ruinous to a man is, because he refuses to believe that which the Son of God revealed. Therefore it is fatal; but how can I quote along with such an error the absurd case supposed by Mr. Gregg? I belong to the only Church which condemns all errors. The holy Scripture said, "Every tongue that rises in error against you, that tongue shalt thou condemn." But what error had the Protestant Church condemned? None, though she had persecuted so many for dissent. I now come to the wrestler, a fine and elegant parable, to prove that the gates of hell had not prevailed against the Church. He supplies an illustration in answer to my case, grounded upon the prophecy that the Church would not be overthrown, and imagines two wrestlers—The Rev. Mr. Gregg and Father Maguire, for example (laughter)—engaged in a contest in which it was foretold that Gregg would not be overthrown. Suppose Father Maguire had staggered his opponent, and again, by a strong exertion, thrown him upon that part sometimes called the haunches, yet the prophecy holds good,

nevertheless, according to the case put, that Gregg was not overthrown (laughter). I suppose, so foolish and ridiculous—but, I will readily admit, harmless—an illustration was never introduced into a serious argument. It borders rather too closely upon the profane, considering that the matter under consideration was the blessed promise of the consubstantial Son of the Eternal Father, that the gates of hell should not prevail against his holy Church. Mr. Gregg tells us that God said he would permit his Church to be brought low. If he means, to be persecuted, I agree with him; but she is not accountable for the heresies of those who went out of her, nor is she stained with their errors. Christ himself said that scandal must come, but woe to those by whom it would come. And St. Paul foretold that there would be heresies, and pronounced that they would exclude from heaven those who would be guilty of them. Those who have left us did not, indeed, belong to us in spirit, or they would not have gone from amongst us. The gentleman travelled to transubstantiation. I expect before the discussion is over to break a lance with him on that subject; and if I do not bring him down, I expect at least "to bring him low." In reference to the Thirty-nine Articles, I have to complain of my reverend friend for misrepresenting me. I never said he could not prove a negative. I only called on him to prove, if he could, those of the Articles which I call negatives—not using the logical term, but meaning negatives as against our positives. Where we say that the bread and wine are transubstantiated in the Eucharist, they say they are not. Where we say there are seven sacraments, they say there are only two. This is what I said, and I must complain of him for putting words into my mouth which are almost too childish for his own. If he proves those negatives, I myself will go over to him.—[The Rev. Mr. J. L. Nolan, who kept up a running commentary upon the discussion, *sotto voce*, here exclaimed, "*We* will not have you!"]—He claims apostolicity for his Church? but how can he prove that? it was not visible for eight hundred years. Is it not a wonder that a Church, which has introduced so many errors as are attributed to the Catholic Church, would not be more tolerable of other people's backslidings? She might be expected to say, the less I speak of other people's errors the less they will speak of mine. But she has never tolerated heresy in any instance. If she had permitted Henry the Eighth to take a beautiful young wife when he became acquainted with Anna Boleyn, there would not now be a parson in the three kingdoms. If she had allowed Henry to do what Luther permitted him to do—separate from his wife Catharine—he would never have been struck with the necessity of change. He admitted her to have been virtuous, but affected to have a scruple of affinity, which it is remarkable only arose after he happened to see Anna Boleyn. I will put one question to my friend to which I crave a direct answer. He admits the validity of the first four general councils—he admits that they were right in condemning the Arians and other heretics. He will probably say that at that time the Church was in its primitive purity, but that it is now fallen into corruption. But if private judgment be the inalienable rule, a pure church had no more right to interfere with that rule than a corrupt one. In such a case the very act of condemning was assuming a right they could never have received; and they would have proved

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

themselves corrupt by the very act. The proceedings of these Councils are admitted by the Church to which Mr. Gregg adheres; and I now ask him what right had they to condemn these heresies, that the Council of Trent had not to condemn Luther? That council included a larger proportion of the Church, and she was aided by the wisdom of the earth. The emperors and kings were present either in person or by their representatives, and though they could not interfere in the proceedings, yet they could do a great deal by inquiry. I ask, then, what right had the first four Councils from Jesus Christ that this one had not? You will receive the four, but you will not receive this because it condemns your own errors. I next come to the gentleman's digression with a view to prove me a horse. But I suppose that requires no answer. He travelled from transubstantiation to holy water; but I thought that I had given him enough of holy water yestesday. He answered none of my arguments then or now. He makes a great deal to do about the sword, but I answer him, "Give that to Cæsar which is Cæsar's." If authority is to be submitted to, and if it must in some cases be enforced by the sword, is it then unlawful to bless it, and to pray that you may not deal wrongfully with it? St. Paul tells us, that prayer blesses all creatures; and is not a sword a creature? Mr. Gregg blesses the meat and the wine on his table; and what actual difference is there between that consecration and that bestowed on the sword?—St. Paul used the expression in reference to meat offered to idols. The heathens were accustomed when they made sacrifices, to offer one part of the animal to the idol and sell the rest in the market. The early Christians were afraid to purchase meat in the markets lest they should be led to partake of the sacrifice to idols. But St. Paul told them not to be too curious; for that every creature of God was good when blessed in prayer. My friend goes into one of the Church of England Articles at length, and quotes about the law and the testimony in reference to his Church. But he is begging the question, for I ask him where has she got her authority? The law and the prophets belong to the true Church, and his Church is now upon her trial, to shew that she has claim to them, and yet he would quote them against us. The question which he assumes is the one litigated, but I will not let him run away with it. When he goes to the Scriptures never was there a man so much to be pitied. He appeals to the Old Testament to prove the New one—he goes to the Scriptures to prove the Scriptures. Was there ever such a blunder? When he did so, he assumed that which I put upon him to prove. Like St. Augustine, I would not believe the gospel if I had not the Church's authority for it; but he has not the Church, and can produce no authority. We heard a great deal about married priests, but I must remind him of St. Paul, who says that "he that giveth his daughter in marriage doth well, but he that giveth her not doth better," and who also says, "it is better to marry than burn." We do not degrade marriage; on the contrary we have elevated it to a holy sacrament; but for wise and just motives all are not permitted to be married. We know that if a clergyman be wedded he thinks more of "the things that are of the world, and how he may please his wife," than of the gospel or administering the sacraments. Look at the parsons, when they are called to attend a case of contagion, is not their answer that they fear not for

themselves, but that they fear to bring the disease among their family? Christ says that any one that will not give up his father and mother, and daughter and wife, and follow him, is not worthy of him. But there is nothing to give up now a-days, for all ends in the comedy and marriage *a la mode*. I will discuss marriage upon the Peter Dens' day; and let the ladies recollect that it is not I who exclude them, but Mr. Gregg. My friend talked of sheep and lambs, as if I had not presupposed a shepherd as well as a flock.

[Mr. Maguire's half-hour ended.]

Mr. GREGG—Before I proceed, I will ask the Rev. Mr. Maguire whether it be his wish that we should continue the discussion this day for an additional hour.

Mr. MAGUIRE—Whatever you please.

Mr. GREGG—Then let us proceed since you are willing.

Mr. MAGUIRE—Most willingly. The longer we continue the better.

Mr. GREGG—I thought it right to ask the question, as it would appear by a report which has gone abroad, that it was I who declined continuing it yesterday.

Mr. MAGUIRE—I am glad to have this opportunity of referring to a statement which appeared in the *Packet* of yesterday evening, of the very contrary nature of that alluded to by my reverend friend; for it asserted that it was I who declined, and that I said we need not tire ourselves, or something to that effect. I know that the *Evening Packet* is always abusing and libelling me, but I disdain noticing its libels or its abuse, and I only take this opportunity to contradict that statement, which is most false. I could have had several actions for libel against it if I had chosen to proceed upon them, but I did not.

Mr. GREGG—It was right that I should have asked your consent to prolong the discussion, according to the rules, as we have agreed to act by mutual consent in such matters. I will now come to answer the speech of my reverend friend. My friends, Mr. Maguire has brought a charge against me of my having said that married men act with more energy, or some such expression. Now, I say, to the pure all things are pure, and it is only the degenerated and contaminated mind which can put a bad construction on the words which I employ. I said that the married clergymen of our church have acted energetically and successfully in raising the temple of the true Church, and spreading its doctrines throughout the world, and in fulfilling the sacred duties of their religion. I appeal to my bretheren, the Roman Catholic clergymen who hear me, and I mistake very much whether they will not agree with me, that a clergyman will not fulfil his duties with more single-mindedness, and more purity when he is not married than when he is. I appeal to them whether such is really their opinion, and I am sure that if Mr. Maguire himself would but make the experiment, he also would be of my opinion. He tells you that the clergymen of our church are deterred from attending on the dying, through fear of bringing the contagion into the bosom of their families; but nothing can be more unfounded than that assertion, and I could refer to innumerable examples where our ministers have fallen victims to the danger which they willingly incurred on such occasions. I need but refer to the case of the Rev. Robert Maguire, of this diocese, as one fact sufficient to refute him. But I will also say, that we Protestants prepare for dying before the death bed—we do not leave that awful business to the last moment. I thank God that we prepare for

death daily; we need not be running for the priest in the last moments of our dying friends. Blessed be God, we take timely precaution against that necessity! Mr. Maguire will say that I am not come here for preaching, but I tell him my object in coming here is to preach, and to endeavour to convert the hearts of those who are going astray from the ways of truth. Oh! my brethren, let me tell you that Popery is a spirit—it is impalpable, and cannot be detected by syllogisms and sophistical arguments, and the vain maxims of a false logic. Now it is my firm conviction that God caused this discussion to take place, in order that the clergymen of the Protestant Church might be taught the true way in which the discussion between the two Churches should be conducted. I caused a work of Dr. Meade's—a most useful work indeed—"The Apostacy of Latter Times," to be republished; and in this it is taught that it is not by standing on such topics as private judgment and the like that the discussion should be carried on, but by taking a general view of the whole subject, and arguing on the general question, to prove that our Church is the true Church of Christ. My opponent attacks me again and again on private judgment. I never saw such hacking and hewing and trouncing as he has on the subject; but all this time he is only doing my work. He has imagined to himself that I stand solely for private judgment, and he challenges me to prove the canonicity of the Church from Scripture. Am I not proving every subject which I have undertaken to defend? Now, to satisfy your private judgment on this subject I will tell you what my doctrine is: use your private judgment, and defer to the judgment of the Church. Mark me, I only say defer. I support the doctrine of the holy Catholic Church, and it is because I stand on that firm foundation, and not from any powers of my own, that you behold me here, my bretheren, triumphant and unanswered. To-morrow I will bring here to you abundance of our prayer-books and hymn-books, and other books of piety, and I will show you that they contain nothing but purity—that they breath nothing but the sincerest and most unsullied sentiments of Christian sanctity; but if you take up any of the Romish books of devotion, you will be told, don't touch this and don't touch that; you find something which you should not read—Hymns to the Virgin Mary, and Hymns to St. Valentine, and devotions to the cruel and tyrannical St. Dominick, chief of the inquisition. I will prove to you that they contain dreadful abominations. To-morrow will be my day of assault. To-morrow the Church of Rome will be on her trial, and it will be my turn to show you that she is plunged in abominations and errors, and that it is for that reason that we have left her. When I argue with Mr. Maguire, I use a different method from that which I would employ if I had to deal with a different class of opponents. When I tell him that I believe the Scriptures to be the word of God, suppose I say that I believe so because I receive them from his holy Church, what objection can he have against that reason? What can he urge against a principle he admits himself? But I also say that we have within us the Holy Spirit, which also tells us that they are true. Yes, I feel that I have that within my breast which dictates to me that that book is the revelation of the Most High. But if every one say that they have the Spirit, it will be asked, how are we to know who has the true Spirit, and which is the false spirit? I say one mark is, when we hear persons pretending to have the Spirit out of the Church of Christ, we may be sure that it is a false spirit. It is not a private spirit which I have

within me, and which points out to me the truths of God's word. Blessed be God, it is that Spirit which acts in unison with the holy Church of Christ itself; and I thank Heaven from the bottom of my soul for bestowing it on me! Mr. Maguire says that I and the Unitarians, and other sects, agree in the doctrine of private judgment as the rule of faith. I deny the assertion over again. We do not agree in our rule of faith, or in our acceptation of private judgment, because I reprobate the abuse of private judgment—I defer to the public judgment of the Church. In the 8th Romans we find—'But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now, if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." And, again—"For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." Here you see how the Spirit is known in those whom it possesses. Again, when he asks me how I convert the Jews, my answer is, that I would convert them in the same manner that I would the Christians—I would hold up Jesus to them from my pulpit, and I would cry out to them that he suffered and died for the redemption of them and all mankind; and I would turn my eyes to heaven as it were to watch the descent of the Holy Ghost into their souls. Read the 10th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. There it is said—"And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him and fell down at his feet and worshipped him. But Peter took him up, saying, Stand up, I myself also am a man." And in the 34th verse—"Then Peter opened his mouth and said, of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him, and we are witnesses of all things which he did, both in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem, whom they slew, and hanged upon a tree," &c. Mark well, my friends, the simplicity and unglossed character of this narrative of the apostle; here there is no rant; nothing but simply telling the story of the Lamb of God. Mark the conclusion. "While Peter was yet speaking these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word." This and this only, was the way to convert the Jews, and to bring them out from the captivity of satan; and do not deceive yourselves, any other way to convert the soul is but delusion. Observe well what I am about to say, and do not imagine that it is profane. I say it in the spirit of truth. The distinguishing marks of the Church of Christ and of the Church of anti-Christ are analagous. Do not be startled at the word; I say they are analagous. The mark of the Church of Christ is that it casts out devils; that of the Church of anti-Christ that it casts out God. I tell you that God is cast out of the soul of man when he is taught to believe that he should have any reliance on his works, or on the intercession of any but one. Mark how the Romish Church proceeds to convert the soul. Instead of looking to Jesus—I grant, ineeed, that they do pretend to look to Jesus, I have it here in the bag—but they will tell you it would be very salutary for you to put on a hair-cloth shirt, and that it would be most useful for your salvation to apply a scourge to your back, and practice a hundred other tortures. Oh! these good works are all the seed of evil and apostacy from the true merits of Christ! You will find good works in the true Church, but good works which are trampled under foot, and treated as rags and dust. I do not regard my good works; it is the merits of Jesus Christ alone that work within me. This, my friend, is the contrast between the doctrines of truth and those of error. In the epistle of Paul to the Galatians, which was expressly written against

Popery in its infancy, the Apostle says, "Oh, foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that you should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently sent forth crucified among you? This only would I learn of you. Receive ye the spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish?—Having begun in the spirit, are ye now made perfect by flesh?" And who thus addressed the Galatians? "Paul, an apostle, and all the brethren which are with me, unto the Churches of Galatia." Mark me, laity, mark your own privileges. You are fellow-labourers, and fellow-workers in the instruction of the Gospel. I must now go on to some other points; however, I can only consider them one at a time, and whilst I am endeavouring to follow my reverend friend through his wanderings, he will ask me why do I not prove the thirty-nine articles? I come to the 140,000 fighting men, mentioned by the Rev. Mr. Maguire. I grant that there were 140,000 men in the Church, but they were fighting men, and fighting men do not constitute the Church.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—Mr. Gregg has concluded by a flourish about fighting men. Why did I quote that passage? The King of Israel intended to cut off the faithful, when the tribe of Benjamin sent out so many fighting men to protect them. I hope he will admit there may be fighting men among the faithful, unless he holds it unlawful to fight. I I took up this statement, as it was his last, lest I might forget it; but I now go back and begin with the beginning. He tells you that my doctrine of marriage is erroneous, and that all should be free to marry. (Mr. Nolan here indulged in a broad grin). I see a smile upon those who were not free to marry, but have married; but I beg that I may not be forced to take up their case, for I must be charitable (applause). The apostle Paul says, when men are married they get entangled in the affairs of the world, their thoughts are turned from God, and they give more thoughts to their wives than to the Church. Let me not be accused of indelicacy when I quote from the Scriptures, and remind you that St. Paul says, "It is good for man not to touch a woman;" and the blessed Scriptures tell us that some are eunuchs from nature, some are made eunuchs by man, and others make themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven. (More cachinations from Mr. Nolan, with several most expressive winks.) I don't wonder that the apostles of the new school laugh at this, though it be from the Bible. Mr. Gregg says the vow of celibacy is not binding, since it is taken when he who makes the pledge does not understand it. This is the excuse of some half-shorn apostate who is at a loss for a subterfuge to disguise his iniquity. No person takes the vow till he is three and twenty or four and twenty, and I ask you if that be an age to misunderstand the nature of it? Can educated young men, who have spent their years from their youth upwards at college, and who have read the Scriptures, and had professors of the Scripture to instruct them, have any doubt on such an undertaking, or can they be deceived into taking it? But it is needless to preach morality to some people, who if St. Paul came down again from heaven, would not listen to his voice, if it warned them away from the seductions of diversion and impurity (applause). My friend talked of lifting up Jesus, I wish I could see him that I might join, for by no other name can man be saved. What does he mean by saying that Protestants are prepared to die, and by insinuating that Catholics are not? I ask him to name a single Catholic that has died a Protestant, I will produce the names of a thousand Protestants who were violent per-

secutors and haters of Catholicity, who upon their death bed were glad to come to the oils they ridiculed before they went to their God. But if he names one man who lived a decent Catholic and died a Protestant, he will do more than any man that has gone before him for Protestanism. He quotes St. Paul to show that his fellow labourers in the early Church were inspired. Does it follow because they were inspired that we must be so? They wrought miracles. St. Paul's apron (for he was a tent-maker) and his handkerchief were sent over the country, and cured the the sick and maimed, and wrought various other miracles (laughter). You may laugh, but it is in the Scripture. When you show to me your people working miracles with their handkerchiefs and aprons, then I will believe you inspired. But I fear there is abroad more of the spirit in which Luther delighted, when he said that he was a mere dry theologian without the aid of the devil, with whom he tells us he eat a peck of salt, and had various discussions upon matters of faith. Mr. Gregg referred to Meade upon apostacy! Now, I happened to have been reading an elaborate work by my friend, in which he states that one of the points raised in favour of the Catholic Church staggered him, and had nearly converted him, until he saw it answered in Meade. Now, it appears that only that Joseph Meade was born the Catholic doctrine would be unanswered; and where would have been my friend's reliance upon his apostolic Church? I come back to the Thirty-nine Articles; but there he cries *noli me tangere*—it's a dangerous subject. He ridicules our oil: let him look to James. He admits the canonicity of the book, though Luther doubted it—and he will find oil recommended for sick men, with which they were to be anointed. Let him look to that. Perhaps he will answer, with Mr. Pope, it was on account of the hot climate the oil was recommended. But he must not forget that the inspired writers spoke for the whole Church, and for all time and for all nations. Again I ask him to prove that there are but two sacraments, as set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles. I never was more astonished than when I heard him admit that he would prove the Bible by the Catholic Church. If he takes it from her, how can he refuse to take her interpretation? Is not she who collected and preserved it, and handed it down to us, best able to judge of it? When he gave us the grand foundation, he may readily give us the stones with which to raise the edifice. He cannot prove the canonicity of the Scriptures but by our Church, and he will tell you that that Church has fallen into error. How then can he have an uncorrupted Bible from her? How can he make an act of faith upon a fallible authority? He quotes a text—"as many as are led by a Spirit of God;" but who are led by the Spirit of God? They of the true Church only. Can that Church be his who, as I shall show you before this discussion terminates, added to the Scriptures, subtracted from them, and mistranslates them? If the Church be the authority for the Scriptures, then is it greater than the Scriptures, and that is my doctrine. If the Scriptures be the rule of faith, then the rule should be complete. Yet Mr. Gregg knows that twenty-two books of the Scriptures have been lost—twenty of the Old Testament and two of the New. How can that be a rule of faith which is not a whole rule? He may say that a part of the Scriptures is sufficient; if so, what part? Perhaps he will say the whole of the books we have. Let him show me the text for it. He quotes from the Thirty-nine Articles, and these be the canonical books of whose authority there never was any doubt in the Church. I ask him, does he not

know that Luther rejected James and the Apocalypse? He knows that the Apocalypse was rejected for three hundred and twenty-nine years. Eusebius, a learned critic of the Church, declares that it is not true, and quotes Dionysius, who expresses a similar opinion. An early Council said of it, "let the Church beyond the sea (meaning Rome) be consulted, whether adding this book be canonical." How, then, without the authority of the Church can he prove the Bible, and how can he take the authority of the Church if it ever could have apostatized? I hope these objections will be answered. What security has he, I ask again, that the Bible is faithful? I shall give you hereafter a history of the variations and mistranslations of the Protestant version. I want Mr. Gregg to answer me this question,—How can an ignorant Protestant make an act of faith? He cannot read for himself; his parsons are fallible, his bishops are fallible; his Church collectively is fallible, and he cannot examine the original and satisfy himself of its authenticity; and yet without faith it is impossible to be saved. St. Chrysostome and Jerome accuse the Jews of corrupting the Bible; how do you, Sir, know that the Church of Rome, which you accuse of so manifold errors, did not corrupt it? I will expect an answer to these questions, particularly the case of the poor Protestant who cannot read, and who, making the Bible his sole act of faith, knows nothing about it. Mr. Gregg talks of holding up Jesus to convert the Jews, but his flight was unworthy of a reasoning Christian. If the Bible be the sole rule of faith, will Mr. Gregg tell me how he will prove infant baptism, or his authority for aspersion instead of immersion. How will he prove the Holy Ghost is from the Son as well as the Father—or what is his authority for changing the Sabbath from Saturday? Let him show me the Trinity or consubstantiality in the Scriptures; but no, he cannot prove a tittle of them from the Bible—nor the Athanasian Creed, which he holds as firmly as the Gospel.

Mr. Maguire's half hour here ended.

Mr. GREGG—It gratifies me exceedingly that I speak before an intelligent audience. Were it not intelligent indeed, it might possibly be led away by mere words, sounds without meaning—flimsy, sophisticated arguments; but I am safe in the correctness and justness of your judgments. Now, mark me well, my friends, I have particular arguments for particular persons. When the Unitarian and the Socinian oppose me, I have arguments of a particular nature to meet them with; but my reverend friend is not an Unitarian or a Wesleyan, and he must be content to be treated by me as a Roman Catholic clergyman. Really, my friends, when I hear the arguments which are urged against me, I feel almost inclined to use an expression of Luther's, and say—"I think I smell an Atheist." He attacks me as if I had no other arguments than those which I urge against him, to employ on any other occasion; but I tell him, that on the subjects of the transferring of the Sabbath to the Lord's day, and in fact baptism, and of two sacraments, &c. I stand on the same ground that he does, and say, that I have received them from the holy Catholic Church; it is on her authority that I admit them; and that reply shall and ought to be sufficient for him. But I could also refer him to many examples in the sacred Scripture, to illustrate and prove the authority of the Church of Christ in respect to these points, did I think it necessary to bring them forward. It is sufficient for me that I prove my Church to be the Church of Christ, and then I receive those things on her authority. But, in truth,

Mr. Maguire is only on the defensive himself to-day, and instead of attacking me, he is only endeavouring to defend himself from my attacks. To-morrow I shall again have the advantage of attacking him—for it will be my turn. Now, notwithstanding all that I have repeatedly said on the subject of private judgment, he will be at it again, and again assert that I hold it as the sole rule of faith. He says that a great portion of the Scripture was lost. Now, that I admit; but mark well my answer. I say that if there were five hundred Scriptures, like that volume, they would all accord with what that volume contains, and contain nothing contrary to it; hence they would be unnecessary, and it is by the providence of God that they do not exist. Thus, I blame the Church of Rome, not because she has some doctrines which are not contained in that book, but because she teaches doctrines directly and most distinctly contrary to it. I say that if the Church of Christ thought fit to institute a rule according to what is mentioned in St. James, in attending on the sick, she would be right in so doing, and I would agree in it; and I do not blame the Church of Rome because she instituted such a rule, but because she erected it into a sacrament. Here is her ritual, and we have in it a description of the whole ceremonial of the occasion. How the priest enters the chamber of the dying man, with his surplice and violet stole—how the cross is presented to the patient to be kissed—how the holy water is sprinkled, &c.—how the oil is rubbed to the organs of the different senses, aud to various parts of the body, with the prayer, "By this holy unction, and his own most pious mercy, may the Lord indulge you what you have sinned, by hearing, smelling," &c. Here we have the whole ceremony of superstition, with all its flash and trash; and I ask you, can any thing be a more melancholy demonstration of what superstition will lead men to? As to the lost books of the Scripture, I again repeat that I am firmly convinced that it was by the providence of God that they were lost, because they were unnecessary, as containing only what we possess in this volume of the Holy Bible. The reason why we receive that book as the word of God is, because the spirit within tells us so. The same spirit tells us, that those books called the Apocrypha are not the word of God; for, in one of those books we find a man praised for having committed self-murder. Now, as to the 4th Psalm, to which he referred as containing four verses more in the Prayer-book than in the Bible, I will only inquire, who told him that the Book of Common Prayer is infallible? Have I said that it is? The whole consists in this, that the Psalms in the Prayer-book are a different translation from those in the Bible, and that the verses which are not found in the authentic version of the latter, are found elsewhere. Again! mark me, my friends, I do not say that the Church apostatized so that the gates of hell prevailed against it. The true Church of Christ ran like a stream of pure water in the midst of the fallen Church, until at length it burst out from the midst of it, and now stands, as you behold it, glorious, triumphant, and spotless! As to the apostacy of the Church, we have the description of its real nature in 1st Timothy, chap. 4:—"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth." We find it also described in

several parts of Ezekieal; and in the Apocalypse we read—"And I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-coloured beast, full of names and blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns; and the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations, and filthiness of her fornications; and upon her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great, and the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth; and she was drunken with the blood of the saints," &c. Thus, a drunken harlot is the figure of the apostatized Church. "And the seven heads are seven mountains." Now, do we sit on seven hills? Do we forbid to marry, and to eat meats? Are we the Church described in the Revelations? or is it not clearly the Church of Rome which is pointed out? It is she that is clothed in purple and scarlet—she that forbids marriage—she that is seated on seven hills. But, my brethren, what are we come here to argue on? We are come to discuss the way to heaven. I appeal to you, my friends. Judge of the tree by the fruit. Judge from the books of pure aud unsullied piety which I shall exhibit to you. Judge from the fallen and degraded state of Ireland. Look at her miserable condition—her people wretched, and ignorant, and superstitious at home, and degraded and despicable abroad. Is not the Romish religion the cause of all this? Are not those her fruits?

Mr. Gregg's half hour being out, the discussion concluded for the day. When the reverend gentleman sat down his friends commenced clapping hands and other noisy demonstrations of approval which lasted for some minutes.

THIRD DAY.

THURSDAY, May 31st, 1838.

Mr. Maguire rose a few minutes after eleven o'clock, and said, I call upon Mr. Gregg to prove the Roman Catholic Church is the Church of Anti-Christ, and the great apostacy foretold.

Mr. Gregg—I shall feel great happiness in responding to the challenge of my reverend opponent, because I expect that my demonstration will have a salutary effect upon many present, and among others, I trust, upon my reverend opponent. But very miserable will I feel in showing, as I must show, that an unhappy calamity has fallen upon so large a portion of Christendom. Now, my dear friends, keep in mind one thing, that I now stand up against one of the very ablest advocates that has appeared in these days for the Church of Rome. One whose acumen is great, whose skill and tact are exceeding, and whose natural

abilities are unequalled. My dear friends, recollect that I have opposed to me a man whose powers of reasoning are more complete than any man's in his Church. But my rev. friend, in consequence of his apostacy, has his admirable natural abilities diminished, and his reason shackled down. It weighs upon his wings which else like the eagle's, would soar upwards. He is like Sampson, shorn of his strength when he cowers before the test of truth. If I prove that in this present discussion, that many of his arguments have been merely subtleties, and most of his conclusions *non-sequiturs*, I think I will have done much towards demonstrating our cause. First, I will convict him of a heresy, not only against the rules of the holy Catholic Church, but even against those of his own. He has pronounced the union between the Church and state corrupt; but I shall prove that it is Christian; and further, that it is bordering upon a dangerous heresy to say the contrary. The rev. gentleman brought forward as a proof of holy water the use of the waters of jealousy, which being given to persons suspected of adultery, produced certain physical effects. This usage he referred to as a demonstration of the legality of holy-water. Now, holy water is used for driving out the devil from places where it is sprinkled, and the waters of jealousy were used to detect a sin by causing the belly to swell and the thigh to rot—and he says the one is a proof of the other. He produces one case as an argument in favour of another not a bit like it. Thus I might say, Jesus rose upon the third day, therefore—what conclusion do you think I shall come to—therefore we shall all rise upon the third day; John the Baptist was beheaded, therefore we should not eat meat upon Friday. Is not one as much a *sequitur* as the other? Again, he quotes a water which was used by those who were bit by the mad serpent; but we know they were cured by looking at the brazen serpent, which was a type of Jesus Christ. Would he have used arguments so inconclusive, if apostacy had not blinded the eyes of my reverend opponent? There is not a man in the empire who more thoroughly understands the uses of logic. Indeed his fame for logical subtlety is so great, that in a late periodical he was represented as being prepared to prove any thing. I gave you, as an illustration, the case of a man believing himself a house-clock, as a familiar way of showing how one error would be ruinous to a man's reason; for, as the Scriptures tell us, "One deceit caused Israel to err, in every work thereof." Thus when a man is taught that a piece of bread is not a piece of bread, he may next imagine that in a fly he sees satan, or that an egg at his table is an evil spirit. Why is Ireland called a blundering nation?—and why famous for making bulls, but that she is blinded by apostacy? So fine a nation—I will not say a finer, but so fine a nation exists not in the world, if her eyes were opened to the truth of the gospel, and turned away from the delusions of heresy. If I had been in Mr. Maguire's place, instead of attempting to ridicule the illustration, I should have been content with saying, "You are mistaken; a man may believe himself a house-clock, and yet be a very good member of society." I would have disproved, if I could, instead of laughing at, a case in point. The rev. gentleman puts himself into every position but his proper one. He argues as an infidel, an Unitarian, Presbyterian, or any thing but a Catholic. He was scanda-

lized yesterday when I spoke of running a sword into the belly. The spirit of Dens broke out in him, and he commenced to anticipate Saturday. I blushed for the ladies, and I am sure they blushed for themselves. Mr. Maguire asks how can we rely upon the Bible, if we do not rely upon the Church we got it from. What! would he have me disbelieve a letter, because it was conveyed to me by a drunken postman? I shall now proceed to show you that our Church is holy and apostolic, and consequently that his is apostate, as both cannot be right. Why is Popery among us? Because God permitted Anti-Christ to come, and he shall soon demonstrate himself. He is with us or with you; and if we be holy, there then is the beast (looking expressively at Mr. Maguire, which caused much laughter). I shall give Mr. Maguire hard work before he has done. He will find that he has caught a tartar. I will now proceed to the consideration of the negative articles, respecting which Mr. Maguire said so much. The following is the tenth article:—"The condition of man, after the fall of Adam, is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable unto God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will and working within us, when we have that good will." The proofs are as follow:—2d Corrinthians, iii. 3; John xv. 3—"Now you are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you;" Eph. ii. 3; Canticles i. 4? Rom. viii. 9. I now proceed to the eleventh article, on the justification of man—"We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ—by faith, and not by our own works or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely expressed in the Homily of Justification," see Rom. iii. 20—"Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin;" and 25—"Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God," Rom. v. 1. "Therefore being justified by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." I now proceed to article twelve, on good works:—"Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins and endure the severity of God's judgment—yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring up necessarily of a true and lively faith; inasmuch as by them a lively faith may be evidently known, as a tree is discerned by the fruit." Ephes. ii. 10—"For we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus, unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them;" James ii. 17, 19—Luke xvii. 10, "So likewise ye, when ye have done all those things which are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do;" Gal. v. 22, 23; Matt. vii. 17, "Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit, but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit." Let us now look to the thirteenth article, on works before justification:—"Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of his Spirit are unpleasant to God; forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus

Christ. Neither did they make men meet to receive grace; or, as the school authors say, deserve grace of congruity: yea, rather for that they are not done as God willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but that they have the nature of sin." The proofs are—John xv. 5; Matt. xvii. 7; Rom. viii. 9; Gal. iii. 17. I now proceed to works of supererogation, article fourteen—"Voluntary works besides, over and above God's commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety; for by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required. Whereas Christ sayeth plainly, 'When you have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.'" Now for the proofs I refer to, Matt. xv. 9; Col. ii. 8; Luke xvii. 9—"Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not;" and 10, "So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded, you say, we are unprofitable servants, we have done that which it was our duty to do." I now proceed to the sixteenth article of sin after baptism—"Not every deadly sin willingly committed after baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost and unpardonable! wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin; and by the grace of God we may arise again and amend our lives; and, therefore, they are to be condemned which say, they can no more sin as long as they live here or deny the grace of forgiveness to such as truly repent." For prooof of this I rest upon Gal. vi. 1, and Matt. vi. 16, 17. It is not necessary that I should deal with the affirmative articles, as the negative ones were the objects of my reverend opponent's attacks. I hope the reverend gentleman will not say any more that I have not defended the Thirty-nine Articles.

Mr. Gregg's half-hour ended here.

Rev. Mr. Maguire—Gentlemen, I am glad that I have prevailed on Mr. Gregg at length to venture even to mention the Thirty-nine Articles. God knows I badgered him long enough before he did so; and still see how he defended himself. He contented himself with reading over an immense number of tracts which have as much to do with the proper subject of controversy as they have to do with the question, whether a man can be a house-clock. But look, I pray you, at the desultory warfare which he is carrying on. He undertook to prove the apostacy of the Roman Catholic Church. He says that either his Church or mine must be apostate. Now I say that neither is apostate. He may say my religion is a heresy. I assert that he is heretical. But then heresy is not apostacy. Apostacy consists in the denial of Jesus Christ, and neither of us deny him, therefore neither of us are apostates. Now, let me ask you, Sir, what have you done? You have overwhelmed me with a multitude of texts not bearing on the subject, because I have all along been challenging you to quote from the Scriptures. Now I do not accuse you of disingenuity, though if you had another sort of antagonist, he, perhaps, might, with some appearance of justice, do so. You say that I quoted the example of the waters of jealousy, and that I might as well argue that because our Saviour rose from the dead on the

third day, all of us would likewise arise from the dead—as draw any conclusion from it in favour of my views. Now, I did not mention the waters of jealousy without any view to its effect upon the woman, but merely to shew that, as water and clay were blessed under the old law, so might they be blessed under the new. The argument about arising from the dead is none of mine; such nonsense never came out of my mouth. I know, and you admit, that the bite of the fiery serpent was cured by looking on the brazen serpent; but that is not all, it was ordered to be burned, and its ashes were wet with water that was blessed, and whenever any one fell into unfaithfulness and idolatry, this was sprinkled upon him, and he was purified from his crime. Now, is not this another strong argument in favour of the lawfulness and propriety of blessing water. Yesterday you made a great speech about that bug-a-boo question of anointing; I ask you, now, was not Christ himself anointed previous to his death—and are you aware (I don't think that you are) that you yourselves anointed down to the reign of James the First—and that in your own Book of Common Prayer, there is a form laid down for the ceremony. My reverend friend admits that this is a divine ordinance, and that it would be followed in his Church if it were recommended by the bishops. That is to say, James the inspired apostle, or, in other words, God himself, has instituted this practice, but the Church has not recommended it, and therefore it is not adopted. Therefore the Church is greater than God. But his Church is, according to himself, fallible, and God is infallible. Now, I ask him—and let him answer me fairly—if an angel (and an angel, mind you, is infallible, otherwise it would cease to be one) were to come down from heaven, and say, "You have robbed the poor of a sacrament—you have abolished a divine institution: restore it, and always practice it"—would he do so if the Church did not recommend it? Would he believe that angel? St. Paul says, "If we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other doctrine than that which I preach, let him be anathema." Now, I say to you, Sir, you would be bound to receive this infallible angel, for your Church and your preachers are fallible; but we would not be obliged to receive him, for we belong to an infallible Church, are under an infallible head, and have infallible scriptures. I now refer you to the ritual of Edward VI. where it says—"Then the priest anoints the infant on the head, and then prays as follows." [He read the prayer, which was to the effect that the Almighty God might anoint him with the unction of divine grace and the Holy Spirit.] First he puts on the real oil, and then he implores of God to anoint him with his grace. There is the custom set down in the ritual, and it was long practised in his church; yet now they have abandoned it. Why? Because they are guided by no Christian principle, and are driven about by every wind of doctrine. Next, there is the sacrament of extreme unction, which was long preserved in the reformed Church. In the Rubric it is laid down, that if the sick man desire extreme unction, then he should be anointed with the sign of the cross, and it gives the prayer to be used on the occasion. And the preservation of these very things in your Book of Common Prayer it was that made the Dissenters leave you, for they said that you smelled of Popery, and that is the very reason why you get angry when I throw these Dissenters in your teeth;

because you know that any argument which you may advance against me I can retort fifty-fold in the name of the Dissenters. Now, you think you have made a wonderful discovery with reference to the doctrine, that faith alone is necessary to salvation. You have quoted several texts and I heard you with pity endeavouring to draw your inferences from them. I admit the full force of your texts, but not in the way in which you would explain them. I say that faith alone never saved any one, that it never will save any one, and that whoever relies upon it only for his salvation is deceived, abandons Jesus Christ, and is not in the way to heaven. But then it will be objected to me that our Saviour in dying did all that was necessary for our salvation, and that nothing is wanted afterwards. I admit that nothing was wanting on the part of our Saviour, but on our part there was, and is much wanted, both to make atonement for sins which we commit and avoid. That that was wanted was good works, the works of penance and mortification, fasting and alms-deeds. Now, let me give you a few texts directly to the point, and I shall convince you that good works are necessary to salvation, and that faith alone is not sufficient. Our Saviour himself says—"If you would enter into life keep the commandments." Therefore, faith alone will not do, for the commandments must also be observed. Further he says—"Amen, amen, I say unto you, unless you do penance you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven"—and this very text has been translated wrongly by the Protestants, who have put "repentance" instead of "penance" into their Testament.

Rev. Mr. Gregg—Where is that to be found?

Rev. Mr. Maguire—In the Gospel of St. Luke.

Rev. Mr. Gregg—What chapter and verse?

Rev. Mr. Maguire—I did not ask you for chapter and verse. I would have to look for it in order to tell you. It refers to the repentance of the Ninevites, who, he said, should rise up in judgment against the Jews, because they did not repent. And let me ask, was it not in fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes, that Jonas did penance with the Ninevites for three days. I now refer you to St. James, 2nd chapter, and 21st verse—"Was not Abraham our father justified by works when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar," Luke 7th chapter, 47th verse, Matthew 7th chapter, and 21st verse—"Not every man that saith unto me, Lord Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven," Matthew 22nd chapter and 12th verse—where he was punished who did not go to the wedding feast with a wedding garment, which is interpreted to signify good works. 1st Corinthians, chapter 13, verse 2, "And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mystery and all knowledge, and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, it availeth me nothing." This proves not only that faith alone is not sufficient for salvation, but that many have faith without good works, therefore that good works are not a necessary consequence of faith. Now though my friend may have great faith, and notwithstanding he has the private spirit, it will take him a long time before he convinces me that his faith is as great as that of the inspired apostles; yet if he has not charity, it signifies very little to him. I refer you to the 13th verse of the same chapter, "And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three, but the

greatest of these is charity." It is true that "without faith it is impossible to please God," but I add, that without good works it is equally impossible to please him. Again, Colossians, 3rd chapter and 14th verse, "And above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness." Matt., 22nd chapter, 37th, 38th, 39th, and 40th verses. Galatians, 5th chapter, 6th verse—"For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love." 1st Corinthians, 7th chapter, 19th verse—"Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God." Ephesians, 1st chapter, 4th verse—"According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world that we should be holy and without blame before him in love." It is clear, I should think, from all these texts, that faith alone is not sufficient for salvation, and that charity, and good works, and the keeping of the commandments is equally necessary. Luther it was that put the German word *alein* into the text; and when he was spoken to about it, he said that he was an apostle as well as Paul, and it was retained for the purpose of inveigling the unwary, by making them believe that the way to salvation was easier by their church than by ours. I will give you one or two texts on the subject. Hebrews, 5th chapter, 9th verse—"And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." That proves that obedience is necessary for salvation. The whole epistle of St. John proves that faith is not the only requisite. I might quote many more texts, for there are no less than thirty-nine which bear on this point. In the 2d chapter and 14th verse of the Epistle of St. James you will find, "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith and have not works? Doth faith save him?" And lower down, in the 17th verse—"Even so faith, if it have not works, is dead, being alone;" and verse 19, "Thou believest there is one God: thou doest well. The devils also believe and tremble." Now, why was the word "alone" inserted after faith" by Luther? and why has it been preserved, thus making a liar of the Holy Ghost? I have before said, in order to make the easiness of their way to heaven contrast with our prayers and fasting and mortification, and all those holy practices which to them appear so much balderdash. Now, I will tell you what has been the consequence of this Protestant doctrine of all faith and no works. It has created the heresy of the Anti-nomians. It has made those heretics broach the damnable doctrine that the more sins they commit the more glory do they give to God by so doing; for they say, "Faith alone is sufficient to justify us altogether;" forgetting that it has been said, "For by works, and not by faith, can man be justified." Now, I want my friend to answer that. I defy him to answer it.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Where is the last text from?

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I do not ask for yours, because I know where to find them. Now, I will not content myself with having proved that faith alone is not sufficient; I will prove that good works are meritorious before God. For that purpose I refer you to the 18th psalm, verse 20, "The Lord rewarded me according to my righteousness; according to the cleanness of my hands hath he recompensed me." And again in 1st Kings, chapter 8, verse 32, "Then hear thou in heaven, and do and judge thy servants condemning the wicked, to bring his way upon his head, and justifying the righteous, to give him according to his righteousness." And 2nd Chron. chapter 15, verse 7, "Be ye strong,

therefore, and let not your hands be weak, for your work shall be rewarded." Now, Sir, I could go on with fifty such passages; but where is the use? You undertook to prove our apostacy. I need not speak of any thing else if I do not choose. But I am ready to prove that we are not apostate; and I do say that it is blasphemy to assert that an apostle inspired by the Lord foretold the apostacy in the Church, and that not a single true Christian should be left in the world, when Christ himself said that the Church should last for ever. All that I could get from you as to the invisibility of the Church is that it existed in the hearts of some though it could not be seen. In answer I have said *de non existentibus et de non apparentibus eadem est ratio.* He could not answer that. Now, I think I have followed him all through his rambling speech, though I was not bound to do so. It was my business solely to reply to the charge of apostacy. You, Sir, have talked of the Unitarians. I am not an Unitarian. I am ready to meet them on their own ground and to discuss with them their religious belief. But you cannot do so for you have no principle on which to convince them; and this meeting see that, for they see that you have never attempted to answer any of the arguments which I have advanced relative to them. Therefore, I say, Protestantism is without any principle. I do not call on you now to prove the authenticity of the prophecies of Daniel; but I call on you to prove the authenticity of the Revelations. You reply to me that I believe them, and ask me why I require you to prove it. I say, I do believe it; but I believe it on principle. You do not. You say common sense leads you to believe it. You talked to me a while ago of a man fancying himself to be a clock, or a horse, and attempting to act like them. Why, common sense would tell any one who saw him that he was a man; but I ask can you bottom your faith in the scriptures or in the doctrines of the Church upon common sense? St. Paul says, "Faith comes from hearing, and hearing from the words of Christ." Now, as I have often asked before, I ask now how could the words of Christ be heard when they were not preached, namely, during 800 years in which there was no true Church? And if Christ could not be heard how could there be faith? Again, how could you hear without preaching, and how could there be preaching where there was no one to preach? I also ask you who sent you?—from whom have you your mission? There was previous to Luther no Church of yours; you were only a few individuals separating from the Church, and you had no authority. [Mr. Maguire's half hour ended here].

Mr. Gregg—You have all heard, I believe, of a person who was under the discipline of a drummer. He was tied to the tail of a cart, and the drummer, in applying his lash to his back, happened to strike him between his shoulders, O! strike me lower, cried the man; the drummer complied, but the man again exclaimed, strike me higher. Well said the drummer, I am doing all I can to please you, but you will not be satisfied whether I strike you high or low. 'Tis so, my friends, with Mr. Maguire; whatever way I meet his questions, he will not be content. He called on me again and again, to prove the Thirty-nine Articles. I brought abundance of Scripture to do so, and he says I have done nothing. He won't take a single text from me. But, I trust we shall have no more about the Thirty-nine Articles. Now, I really do admire the great talents of my rev. opponent, and I hope he will yet see his errors; and I pray to the Almighty God to convert him from his wanderings. But mark the way he argues with me. He says that we deny the necessity of good

works. Now, I totally deny the truth of that assertion; we, on the contrary, insist on the necessity of good works after justification—"accursed be the man who says that any man is justified in sin." We hold that there is no venial sin mentioned in the Scripture, and that all sins are mortal; and if a man continue in sin to death we pray not for him. I undertake to prove that there is no distinction to be found in Scripture between mortal and venial sins, and that they are all equal, as they are offences against the law and will of God. Mr. Maguire objects to my proofs *in globo*, he objects to all my texts, without showing any particular reason against any of them; but I would take them *seriatim*, and show how they apply to the argument which I support, were it not too tedious, and that I fear the public would tire of it. But if Mr. Maguire will write a work on the question between us, and there endeavour to show that I am wrong, I undertake to write a work in reply, and to disprove every argument which he will bring forward. Now, hear what the articles of the true church say on this subject: "Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgments, yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily from a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit." You see, then, my friends, that we condemn the abominable Antinomian heresy, and, in reality, that heresy springs from the very doctrine of the Church of Rome, of salvation by works. I will prove to you that from that very doctrine all sorts of licentiousness springs; for every one will have a standard of works for himself, according as it may best suit his own mind and his own disposition. I recollect once having spoken on the subject of her conversion to a woman who went to the chapel, and she only said to me, "What sins did I ever commit; I have a good heart, and injure no one, and I have nothing to answer for." Such was her standard of good works, and every man may thus have one of his own. I assent to his proposition that works performed in Jesus Christ are good; but it is through the merits of Christ that they have their merits. Now mark, my friends, the dreadful error into which the followers of the Church of Rome are liable to run. They calculate on vain works and ceremonies, and they put off their conversion to the hour of their death. This is an awful mistake. When Christians think so, and run to us for succour, and for the sacrament, we discourage them, and we preach to them of the danger of such a practice; but if they do insist on it, we do comply, and administer the sacrament to the dying. Were we to administer the right of unction by the authority of the Church, we would have as good ground for so doing as if we had it from an angel from heaven; but I deny that Mr. Maguire will find that rite in our *reformed* prayer-book. It is one of those relics which we had not shaken off when we came out of Babylon, but which we have since cast away. I will now come to a text much dwelt on by my rev. friend, and on which he seems to have placed great reliance. As he did not give the verse in quoting it, I shall, I fear, be at some trouble to find it out.

Mr. Maguire—I shall most willingly assist you.

A voice in the crowd—The 19th chapter of Matthew, verse 16th.

Mr. Gregg—O, then, here I have it: "And, behold, one came and said unto him, good master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" Mark me, my friends, I take the whole context, for it is only

thus that we can arrive at the real meaning of the passage relied on by my reverend friend. Here we have a weak-minded man coming to Jesus, who sees into his heart, and tries him as it were on the very threshold, thus: "Good Master," said he; "why callest thou me good?" replied Jesus, "there is none good but one, that is God." Jesus paused, but the man could give him no answer; then Jesus again said, "but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." He saith unto him, "Which?" Jesus said, "Thou shalt do no murder; thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not bear false witness; honour thy father and thy mother; and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself!" that is, let no tinge of sin be on thy soul; thou hast the law before thee, behold the condition you have to fulfill. The man should have said, "Lord, I have tried all my life to fulfill the law, but I could not do it." This would be that sorrow of soul which would become him, and would be meet in one approaching the Lord; for no man can ever come to Jesus until all hope but evangelical and lawful hope is banished from his soul. He said, "Which?" Jesus replied—now, observe, observe, O, observe, the wisdom of the Lord Jesus; he does not give him the first table of the law; he does no say to him, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole soul!" he deals with him more gently in the beginning—he takes him to the second table, and forbids him to commit any sins. Mark the answer:—The young man evidently moved in a respectable circle, and when he did not commit the grosser sins, he thought that he was perfect, and Jesus saw that, like many in his circumstances of life, he was blinded by his riches, and gave him a precept accordingly. The young man saith unto him, "all these things have I kept from my youth up; what lack I yet?" Jesus said unto him, "if thou wilt be perfect, go and sell what thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come and follow me." Then you will discover what you are yourself—then you will find that you can do nothing—that there is no righteousness in you, except that which cometh to you through another. Thus do we explain this text, not by taking it alone, but in connexion with the context. Thus any one who pretends to understand the Scripture when he takes it piecemeal will deceive himself; for there is a height and a depth about the word of the Lord which obliges us to read it again, and to ponder over it, and consult the Holy Spirit on it before we can pretend to ourselves that we understand it aright. Perhaps it would be well to take another of my reverend friend's favourite texts, and try whether it could not be explained to your satisfaction. Let us take the following:—St. Paul says, "If I should have all faith, so as to remove mountains, and have not charity, it profiteth nothing." Now I will not be drawing vain distinctions, but I will ask him one question before I proceed to the explanation of the text. He asks is he to prove that he is not a house clock, and he appeals to common sense that he is not. Now, if common sense tells us that a man is a man, I appeal also to common sense that bread is bread!—Again he says, *De non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio*, that is, things which do not appear, and things which do not exist, are to be considered as alike. Now, I fasten on him his own principle, and, retorting his ridiculous maxim, I say things which do not appear do not exist, and what does not appear in the bread does not exist. Again, he asks how can I make an act of faith? This was for a long time a *bugaboo* to me; but I ask him what does he mean by it? If it is to do good in Jesus Christ, I answer that we do it—we do it through

the Holy Ghost, who operates within us; but if he only means by it forming his belief on a list of Popes, or such external circumstances, I say we do not make such an act of faith; and I further say, and mark it, my friends, if the truth of the Bible were proved by the strictest demonstration, even that would not enable us to make an act of faith without the influence of the Holy Ghost. But, my friends, there is a saving faith, which is to be distinguished from that of any other kind of faith which resembles much the force of imagination, and might be such as that which moves mountains and effects mighty works. Thus do we find, in the case of John, that he rose up as if he had the spirit of the Lord, and drove furiously over the land, and overcame the kings of the earth; and yet he was rejected by God, and was an idolater; nor was it by the saving faith he was moved. And so in the case of Saul, when the hand of Samuel was on him, he went abroad with a mighty emotion, and dashed through his enemies with more than mortal power. Thus I have no doubt that in an apostate church some may be found with that kind of faith which actuated John and Saul—with that fury which would move mountains; but that is not a saving faith. The devils believe and tremble—mark that, my friends—the devils believe and tremble, bnt theirs is not a living or a saving faith. Now, then, for the apostacy. I come now to prove the apostacy of the Church of Rome; I do not know at which end of such a subject I should commence; but as I have but a minute remaining, perhaps it would be as well for me to take some other of my reverend friend's points. Let us take the case of Abraham, who, it is said in St. Paul, was justified by works. The Apostle, in writing to the Hebrews——

Mr. Maguire then rose.—Gentlemen, Mr. Gregg has told you faith is evidence of good works—he should have said that good works is evidence of faith What has he been saying for the last quarter of an hour? He declared yesterday that he did not come here to argue, but to preach; but I did not do so. I came here to argue, to convince and not waste time in talking of what is not at all connected with the subject. I agree with him in all he has said with regard to good works existing with faith—but I go further, and assert that there can be no faith without good works, and that it shows the knavery of the Church of England in asserting that faith alone is necessary to salvation—opening a road to infirm man to commit every species of crime which he may think proper, and that he will be forgiven, providing he has a good heart and a good disposition. This is what it has done—this is what you, Mr. Gregg, advance. You make the Holy Ghost tell lies; you pervert the Scriptures, and distort the true and literal meaning of the word of God. If any man, says Christ (when the young man went to him), enter into life, let him keep the commandments. You shall now have from me the real explanation;—a young man came to him, and said, "Good Master, what shall I do that I may have life everlasting?" And he said, "Why callest thou me good?"—that is, do you come to me as God, or for instruction as a mere man? and it is evident the young man did look upon him as such; and then Christ adds, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments;" and the young man said, "All these things have I kept from my youth—what lack I yet?" And Jesus said to him, "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have a treasure in heaven, and come and follow me." It is added, "And Jesus looking on him, loved him"—why? because he spoke the truth. I'll explain the Gospel by the Gospel; for, in another part of the Testament, Saint Luke

says, speaking of the same transaction—"If thou wouldst be perfect, go sell what thou hast, and come and follow me." What is that?—what does it mean?—is that a counsel to do good works? Will you do that, Mr. Gregg? Will the parsons of your church sell the tithes, and give them to the poor—tithes which has been the cause of inflicting foul murder, and of shedding the blood of the widow's son? You are told that "you shall not kill." That is wrong, say the parsons; you may kill for tithes—and that is the true and proper meaning of the commandment. Yes, you give the word of God your own gloss—you destroy its meaning, and you have, I tell you, Mr. Gregg, destroyed for ever literary honour, character and credit. He talked of works of supererogation, and no doubt in our Church they are practised by many; but they are only counselled, and not commanded to do so. Is it done in the Protestant church? Will the bishops of that church give their twenty and thirty thousand a-year to the poor, and go and follow him? Oh no; and they get out of it by saying, "it would be a work of supererogation." Have I not shown you that the Holy Ghost has not enlightened you—that you make a wrong use of your private judgment—that you are blind, as well as the numerous sects who act upon private judgment—and that, as the Scripture says, "when the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch?" Will you ever be able to get over that? That, I think, is arguing to some purpose. Again, St. Luke says, "unless you do penance, you shall all likewise perish." What was that penance to which he alluded?—the fasting—the prayers—the weeping—the sack-cloth and ashes—the moanings practised by the people of Niniveh. I will be told, forsooth, that these things bear a great semblance to Popery and apostacy; that if we practise good works, we take from the honour of Jesus Christ, who accomplished our redemption by his blood. No, Sir, it is in obedience to the divine commands of Jesus we do so. First, in justification of God for the insult we offered him, and next, in satisfaction to man, and as a restitution either for the loss of his character or his property. They are not good of themselves, I know, for St. Paul says, "What is it that I have not received?"—and the Gospel adds, "No man can come with me unless my Father draw him." Did I say good works of themselves would be of any avail? On the contrary, have I not, over and over, stated that good works without faith are dead; and that faith, no matter how strong, was of no avail unless accompanied by good works, if the person have an opportunity of performing them? Why have you a sacrament, or two of them, at least? You administer baptism and an external sign as a condition of salvation. Christ says, "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you cannot have life in you." You say that faith alone is sufficient for salvation, and thus the effect of the sacraments of of Jesus Christ is irretrievably lost. If faith be sufficient, where is the use in administering any sacrament? "I am the bread of life (adds Christ), which came down from heaven—if any man eat of that bread he shall live for ever." Is not the receiving of that sacrament a good work? But perhaps you will say baptism is not necessary—your church says it is generally so. I ask you why? Because it was one of the conditions on which we were redeemed on Calvary; if you deny that, you do not understand the doctrine of your own church. Gentlemen, Mr. Gregg has told us that he will examine the texts. Why let him do so; indeed I hope he may; but I again say, what sort of rambling has he indulged in for the last half hour? Did he not come here this day to prove the apostacy of

the Church of Rome? He may go over texts, no doubt; but the real matter under discussion is to compare church with church; and if he neglect doing so, I shall not, I promise him. I have shown you that his church taught false doctrines, by insisting that faith alone, without good works, was necessary. In one of his prayer-books, the term "works alone" is found; but, Sir, works alone will not do, unless with the great hope of the blood of Jesus Christ. He insists they are unnecessary, although St. James says, "Is any sick among you?—bring in the priest;" but then this new light—this learned Doctor of Swift's Alley—says, "Oh, not at all; I wouldn't recommend you to do that—I wouldn't advise you, because it would encourage sin." There's the sort of doctrine which he preaches; and I tell him, that though it may pass as good in other places, it will not do here. Gentlemen, you perceive that he has closed on me again, in answer to what I said, that the church and state, politically united, was a corrupt union; and that the church was always a loser by it in point of sanctity—that whatever grandeur or magnificence she may have attained, she lost in grace and in that holiness which was at all times her distinguished characteristic. Look at the Church of England, notwithstanding the saying of Christ, "that it is as hard for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven as it is for a camel to enter the eye of a needle." Those belonging to that church have twenty and thirty thousand a year, with carriages to ride in and soft cushions to sit on, although the unfortunate people who are obliged to support them may not often have a meal to eat, and think very little of the religion which these worthies profess. Well, after talking of church and state, he then began about the validity of holy water, but not a word about apostacy. Was there ever such an instance of shuffling and tergiversation? I merely spoke of its being a lawful practice to bless water, and he waxes wickedly at the idea, although yesterday evening he talked of "the purity of his church running through the pure stream of living waters." So you see they have waters likewise, although they find so much fault with us for using it. Let Mr. Gregg read the holy father, Tertullian, who will tell him that the Christians in his day used holy water, and made the sign of the cross on themselves, "eating and drinking, getting up and going to bed." I ask him again, who is the cause of the Antinomian doctrine—that doctrine to which I have already alluded, as holding that men can commit the greatest crimes—nay, that it is lawful to do so, because it honours Jesus Christ, by proving the efficacy of the blood which he has shed for us? Are you not, Mr. Gregg, the immediate cause of it, by teaching that good works were not necessary at all? and I therefore convict you of preaching and holding false doctrines, that faith alone is necessary without good works. Did you, Sir, see a pamphlet lately published by Mr. Richards, a member of parliament? What does he say? Commit ten thousand crimes—be guilty of murder, incest, blasphemy, adultery—all will be forgiven, because Christ says, "Come to me." I say again, that Protestantism has no principle; that it has not the fruits of the Holy Ghost; that it is a fallible church; that its professors cannot make an act of faith, because it is impossible to do so to a fallible authority; that it was founded on political gain, and nourished by cruelty and blood. The religion of Jesus Christ is not afraid of announcing her doctrines to the world, even before Majesty itself—they are open to all to examine them. She is founded on the rock of truth, which has stood the test of ages, and the stormy billows

of persecution, unchanged and unchangeable, and will continue so till the end of time. I ask you, Sir, can a Unitarian be saved? You have given me an immense number of texts to prove that good works ought to be performed. I admit that, although you hold they are not necessary. You do not believe in the doctrine of restitution, or in Popish fastings or prayers—in going to confess our sins and be sorry for them in making atonement to God and satisfaction to man for the injury he has sustained at our hand. All these things, you say, tend to make a man worse; whereas, those who rob and plunder the people, who neither preach nor read for them, nor administer a sacrament, they improve in sanctity. Now, let us hear what Luther says upon the subject: "Fasting, and prayer, and alms deeds are necessary, and also confessing our sins." I wonder was it from the life of Peter Dens he got it. On Saturday I shall have an opportunity of contrasting the character of those ladies who do not go to confession with those who do, and the manner in which married ladies act who abstain from complying with the wholesome admonitions given in that sacred institution, when compared with those who rigidly adhere to them. We will then see who it is that run away from their husbands, and take with those of others, whose conduct and morals are the subject of every day's discourse, of almost every day's public announcement. In England no less than six hundred in the year run away from their husbands, or exchange them for others, and this is in that Bible-reading country. This will be the proof of the manner in which persons act who do not go to confession—of the evils which follow from the loss of a ghostly adviser, who would tell them, were they on the brink of ruin, or in danger of it, to keep from the wiles and villainy of the seducer, and who would teach them the error of their ways. For, let me ask, if a woman were guilty of conduct of this kind, is it to her husband she would confide the secret? Oh, no! if she did, her lot would be that of the Turkish ladies, to be locked up. And is it not then clear that it would be told her ghostly adviser, whom Mr. Gregg thinks so dangerous, and who would, in the discharge of his sacred duty, warn her of the consequences? Gentlemen, I again repeat, is not this badgering of his pitiful? Why does he not come to the question of apostacy at once, that we may settle the question for ever? Every one who hears me must be tired of this talking at random, when it is principle we came here to contend for. I want to try those of his church by him, and he tells me it is an act of faith. When Christ asked his disciples "Who do men say the Son of Man is?" he was told, "Some say you are Elias, some Jeremias, and others that you are a Prophet;" and he again asked, "Whom do you say I am?" "Lord!" was the reply; "we believe thou art Christ, the Son of the living God." Was not that an act of faith? Why? Because it refers to the Divinity. He could not make such an act, because his church is a fallible tribunal. No one can make an act of faith to man; it must be to God alone; and, therefore, Mr. Gregg, it is impossible that any member of your church can do so. I say again, your church is fallible—it is not guided by the Spirit of God Almighty, but by the will of man, and faith cannot be grounded on the testimony of man. The Holy Ghost did not promise her infallibility—you cannot make her so; and, let me ask, how can an ignorant man be instructed within her pale? He cannot read, and there are hundreds of thousands similarly situated, to my knowledge. How can he make an act of faith? It must be on the Scriptures, for nothing else in your church can

be termed, even by you, as bordering on infallibility; and let me ask you where are the authorized Scriptures? Is it that made by Act of Parliament—the Parliament Bible? Oh! it is time for common sense to look to this—you will not, you cannot, impose on men in this way by fanatical appearances. We all believe in the Holy Ghost as well as those who talk so much about him, and who have his name for ever on their lips—Protestantism, without principle. You are eternally invoking the name of the Holy Spirit. What proof have you that he is with you? Show me that you stand on principle, or that you are even consistent. The Scriptures are from God, and you took them from us. You took baptism from us—nay, there is not a prayer which you use that you did not steal from us. I defy you to show me any thing in your Book of Common Prayer that is not ours; you took the Bible from us—you took the service of your church from us—and yet, forsooth, we are apostates! What are you? Unfortunately for yourself you said the church was invisible—if so, where was it, or where were the Scriptures? If you say they were in possession of the Jews, then they can make an act of faith on them; and if so, the Waldenses and Albigenses will give you such a character as will make you ashamed of them. Who did you get the Scriptures from, then? Your own writers say it was from us. If so, you took them from Babylon, and, according to your assertion, I am in Babylon, and you are out of it; therefore, the Scriptures, according to your showing, must be erroneous. How will you get out of that? You may quote texts of Scripture as long as you please, but shift yourself from the dilemma which I have placed you in if you can. The Holy Bible of God does not belong to you. I will prove that all the promises of the Holy Ghost were given to me. I belong to that Church which existed before the Scriptures or the Gospel were written, which was not till the year 91. St. John's Gospel, which above all others proves the divinity of Jesus Christ, was not written till forty years after the death of Christ, during which time the disciples were preaching and baptizing; and when, in fact, according to St. Paul, Christianity had extended itself over the entire world. So much afraid are you to call yourself a Protestant, that you designate yourself a holy Roman Catholic; and let me ask you, if a letter were directed to the Catholic Priest of Swift's-alley, would it ever arrive at its destination? I should say not; on the contrary, it would have been handed over to the parish priest. There is not a man in the empire would call you a Catholic but yourself—not even the Houses of Lords and Commons. A Protestant Catholic! What a name! What a sound! Yes, you say you are a Catholic, and then you produce a picture! the source of which is gold; and then comes a little shade, which denotes corruption, out of which flows the clear stream of Protestantism. Now, I ask you, before your Protestant friends, have you turned your thoughts seriously to this subject? I ask you, before that God who is to judge us all, have you answered one single question which I have put to you? Sir, before I quit you, I'll go over every single argument which I have adduced, to show the public what you are; for, as Tertullian says, there is nothing of reason, of matter, or of form, in what you have asserted. I go on principle—you have not. You have introduced subjects into the discussion which were totally irrelevant; you talked of good works, and holy water, and oil, and purgatory, and faith, and I tell you this kind of desultory argument is disgraceful to you as well as to me. Why have you acted thus? Why have you proved nothing?

The half hour here closed.

The Rev. Mr. GREGG—I do believe that if a letter were addressed to me to Swift's-alley, as a Catholic clergyman, it would come; but if a person went into the village of Lucan, and asked for the church there, who would think of pointing out the Roman Catholic chapel—or, if one went to Ballinamore, and inquired for the minister of the parish, would any one for a moment imagine that the Rev. Mr. Maguire would be the person pointed out? I have already explained what Catholicity is—that it was a distinct term to distinguish one church from another. The word church implies Catholicity, that is, a church which can easily be discovered; and hence, then, the holy Catholic church is known from all the other churches. The Rev. Mr. Maguire says I have not answered any one of his questions, and he complains of my quoting texts of Scripture—he is not pleased, whatever way I act. He says I got my Bible from him; all I can say is, that I hope he'll come over to us himself, and leave a church which turns matrimony into a comedy, by driving devils out of rings, and converting a solemn ordinance of the holy church of the living God into ridicule. I'll prove to you that we have the Holy Ghost—that if the gospel which I profess has been hidden at any time, it is now hidden from him, and the Spirit of God dwells with us. The Church of Christ put forward her strength; she gave the parliament her Bible, and that parliament, as in duty bound, listened to the voice of God's Church. It has been asked me can a man be saved who does not believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ? I say he cannot—that is the Catholic doctrine, that he cannot be saved; the Church has spoken—God has spoken—the time has come when all voices are obliged to cry out the Roman Catholics cannot be saved. I say to you, my Roman Catholic countrymen, come out of Babylon. I proclaim it here—come out of Babylon—come and join in communion with the Church of Christ. Our bishops are the bishops of the descendants of old; the Popish bishops are not. I have the Catholic Register here, by which it will be seen that almost all the dioceses in Ireland were at one time without a single Popish bishop to preside over them. The dioceses of Derry, Raphoe, Ardagh, Meath, Dromore, Killala, Waterford and Lismore, Cloyne and Ross, Tuam and Clonfert, were all deserted. I shall prove that since the Reformation dioceses have been for hundreds of years in the greatest confusion, without a bishop to fill one of them. We have every thing; the heads of our Church are the successors of the Apostles, and now, will my rev. opponent say I have not answered him? The rev. gentleman is under a mistake when he says salvation is a present thing. I can now see my state, for, by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, my sins are blotted out—I am through him made for heaven. God works our sanctification in our hearts, which is a necessary consequence that my salvation is perfected. I can now perform good works, but I could not do so before that was done. I insist on them because they are now necessary; for, when salvation has taken place, they are of utility; but, before that, faith alone would only do. The grace of God brings faith, and good works follow to assist that faith; but as long as there was no faith, they could be of no avail. Gentlemen, you have heard the promises made that we should on Saturday, be taken to England, in order to scrutinize the characters of the ladies there; but I shall introduce Spain and Italy, where we will see how the married ladies act under the protection of the bachelors. But I must not now trifle further with you. My rev. opponent says we

make no restitution. I say, again, the man who is guilty of fraud, and does not make restitution, cannot be saved, if he has it in his power to make it. Restitution is, he says, done in his Church; no doubt it is. and displayed in the newspapers likewise: 100*l.* received by a Rev. ——. and thus it is trumpeted to the world. Not so in our Church: many and many an act of restitution is made; but it is not pompously put forth, for "the right hand doth not know what the left hand giveth." The rev. gentleman, when he says this, does not know our doctrines—he seems ignorant of the lives of our holy men, of the great Cecil, of Henry Martin, of Cranmer, of Taylor, of Ridley, and other holy martyrs, whose lives have been an ornament to the Church of Christ; no doubt spots may be found in their characters as were found in that of David; but, surely they would not take from their excellence, or from their zeal and piety. Suppose I took one of you to look at a cathedral, the aspect of which was grand and beautiful, but because there happened to be a blemish in one of the walls, therefore its beauty and magnificence should be condemned. It is the character that marks the man, and not any trivial blemish incidental to human nature. Gentlemen, I will, in order to prove the apostacy of the Church of Rome, now come to the prophet Daniel. It is the second chapter (for I assure you this discussion will run from Genesis to Revelations), and runs thus: "Thou, O King! sawest and beheld a great image. This great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee, and the form thereof was terrible. This image's head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron—his feet part of iron and part of clay; thou sawest till that a stone was cut without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and broke them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors, and the wind carried them away; that no place was found for them, and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." And now, gentlemen, for the interpretation. "Thou, O King, art a King of Kings, for the God of Heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, strength, and glory, and after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. And the fourth kingdom shall be as strong as iron, for, inasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces, and subdueth all things, and as iron that breaketh, all these shall it break in pieces and bruise. And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes part of potter's clay, and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided, but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, for as much as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay, and as the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men, but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay. And in the days of these Kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces, and consume all these kingdoms, and shall stand for ever. For as much as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it broke in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold—the great God hath made known to the king what shall pass hereafter, and the dream is certain, and the inter-

pretation thereof sure." The head was of gold, which represented the Babylonian empire; the arms and legs of brass, which represented the Mede and Persian empires; and the fourth was partly iron, mixed with miry clay, which represented the Roman empire. That is the interpretation of the Holy Catholic Church. Mark, the Roman kingdom was divided; it was partly iron and partly clay. The stone which was cut out of the mountains was without hands; that was Jesus Christ. That stone struck the image, and it became a great mountain, which filled the whole earth. The Roman empire consists of two parts, one of iron, which represents the Pagan inhabitants, and the other of clay, which truth demands I should pronounce as Papal Rome. This is awful! There shall be a division, which shows that the mountain was made of clay, and not only that, but with iron, which means Christianity. Do you observe that it was mixed with filthy clay? I assert that that vision represented the See of Rome; and if we want a prototype of the clay we'll find it in filthy Peter Dens. Tremble! my Roman Catholic countrymen, for the forty and two days are come! I do not take Dens alone as the prototype of the clay. Look at the other writers of the Church of Rome. Look at those of De Salis, who, forsooth, is called a saint—a man who, for his foul writings, deserved to be whipped!—a vile, filthy old man! There is also Thomas Aquinas Catigan, who was, I believe, a cardinal. These are called amongst them the *Lectiones Casuisti*---men who should have been taken and scourged. The foulest imagination, the most corrupt and perverse soul, could not put forward anything to the world more foul, more fœtid, more full of abominations, than their writings. But that stain shall become as dust on the floor. Now is the dreadful time—now is the time to go out of Babylon, full of guilt and abomination as she is. "She is the abomination standing in the holy place." Look at the monster falling out of the great city seated on the seven hills. Popery, Popery—eternal damnation is your lot.—[Here the rev. gent. assumed a most extraordinary attitude; standing erect, with his face to Heaven, as if taken possession of by a spirit, he exclaimed, with a tremendous voice—"Fly—fly—fly—fly—fly—the Lord is coming!---coming---coming---coming---coming---coming!" This scene produced a most extraordinary effect; the sober-thinking of the audience thought something wonderful was to happen, while those who boast of the effects of the spirit were loud in their acclamations. After some laughing at what had occurred, silence was again restored, and the reverend gentleman resumed. Excuse me, my brethren; excuse me—I love your souls---excuse me; the image of Papal Rome was before me, and I saw clearly her resurrection from paganism and idolatry. I have here by me a work written by a holy Protestant man---and they are holy people (a titter), who believe in all the divine precepts taught by their Redeemer---and I tell you the Rev. Mr. Maguire is not the man who has the support of Jesus Christ, and he cannot advance any cause in the absence of that support. It is the want of it that makes Ireland what she is; and be assured that I would rather have my tongue cut out by the root than pervert anything in the slightest degree---anything which I do not believe to be true I shall not state. The letter to which I have alluded was written from Rome, and shows clearly what pagan Rome now is. It describes the miracle of St. Januarius's blood, and other abominable fables, which are only fit for old wives to concoct. I recollect a passage in Horace---what the exact words of it are I am really

now at a loss to think of; but the substance of it is a person showing a traveller how insects were melted in a bottle without the aid of fire. This is the way with their miracles—and Popery is the sole cause of all, and the mother of every abomination. Gentlemen, I tell Mr. Maguire he has not answered one of my questions (a titter); he makes trifles of lies; but I would not tell one for the whole world, for I hold it to be a mortal sin.

The half hour here elapsed.

Mr. Maguire rose.—My reverend opponent has told you that I did not answer one single question that he has put to me, or that I have not touched on one single point which he has advanced. To that I shall only say that you are the best judges, and I firmly believe you think that assertion to be as true as what he has said from the commencement of this discussion. Why did he not give me a rejoinder when I asked him for a reply to the many questions I have put to him? The more I press him, the more he shirks and skulks out of it, and that has been his conduct since the commencement of this discussion. He talked of lies, and venial sins, and relics, and he says that he defies me to prove any such thing as a venial sin. This will be a test of his knowledge even of his own Bible. I shall quote some passages from that of his own church, namely, Burke's Bible, which was printed in the reign of James I., the then head of the Church of England. You, Mr. Gregg, I must tell you, in the first instance, have no authorised edition, for when you print one it must be by the authority of parliament (of parliament, mind that, gentlemen; who, pray, made the parliament the head of the church?), and it therefore ought to be signed by the bishops and lords of that assembly. But just attend. In the first chapter of Exodus, verse 17, we find this:—"But the midwives of Egypt feared God, and did not as the King of Egypt commanded them, but saved the men children alive. And the King of Egypt called for the midwives, and said unto them, why have ye done this thing, and have saved the men children alive? And the midwives said unto Pharaoh, because the Hebrew women are not as Egyptian women, for they are lively, and are delivered ere the midwives come in unto them. Therefore God dealt well with the midwives, and the people multiplied, and waxed very mighty." The Israelites were increasing too greatly, like the poor Papists in Ireland—the more water they drank, and the more they were starved, except when eating the potatoes, the more they multiplied. The more Popery was resisted, and the more murders were committed on its hapless professors, the more it multiplied. You, Sir (turning to Mr. Gregg), have talked of our sees being vacant, and our flocks neglected at one period. What caused it but the bloody penal laws, which made it death for a priest or bishop to exist in the land, or to perform any of its sacred duties? Well, but to the argument of telling lies, and counting it in many instances a venial sin. When the midwives were called to an account by Pharaoh, their answer was, "The Hebrew women are not as the Egyptian women, for they are lively, and are delivered ere the midwives come in unto them; therefore God delt well with the midwives, and the people multiplied and waxed very mighty." Come, now, Mr. Gregg, answer me, if they told the lie to excuse themselves, and because they feared God—attend closely to this—are they as guilty as if they had told the truth, and be thereby guilty of murder? Had they told the truth, the children would have been murdered—that would have been a mortal sin. We

maintain the excuse was not a mortal sin—they were only guilty of telling a lie; and do you class that as being fully as enormous a crime as if they had committed murder? Is there then no difference in the eye in the various shades of crime? Is telling a lie to prevent murder as great a crime as murder itself? See now what a dilemma you have got yourself into. I shall now refer you to another text, which I think will settle the question, with all save yourself: St. Paul says, in Hebrews, the 11th chapter and 31st verse—"By faith Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace." We all know she hid them in flax-seed, and that when messengers came to look for them, she told them they had just gone out in the gate, although they were concealed in her house at the time; and St. James, ii., 25th verse,—"Likewise was not Rahab justified when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way." Both these acts were damnable according to you, Mr. Gregg, although St. Paul and St. James expressly declare they were rewarded by gold for not delivering those concealed up to those who were sent to look for them. The midwives of Egypt were also damned, according to you, for not delivering up the innocent to be slaughtered; and this is the doctrine you preach! Nice doctrine; eh? Mr. Gregg. St. Matthew says there are three kinds of sin, none of them deserving of hell. The hypocrite, however, will pretend so, that is, he who "strains at a gnat, and swallows a camel." In the 12th chapter of that Evangelist, and 36th verse, we find "that for every idle word that men shall speak they shall render an account in the day of judgment." Now, if I said a cow's horn were eleven feet long, that in your eyes would be as bad as if I murdered you going home this evening, and thus put an end to the discussion; but I won't, for I assure you I'm not tired of you yet. All these, with you, are equal in the eyes of God. Oh, Sir, it would not be just, it would not be consistent with the mercy of God to make them all alike, who will reward every one according to his works. If I be as bad as Anti-Christ, or Caligula, or Nero, who opened his mother's womb, and set Rome on fire, I am on a level in point of guilt, according to you, with the man who tells a jocose lie, or who laughed at you, as I am sure many did, during this discussion. It is inconsistent with common sense, and believed by no one except those who have an interest in doing so in order to get the tithes. Indeed I hope they will give you a fair share of them, for I believe you deserve it. St. Luke, 12th chapter, 47th verse, says, "That the man who knew the law and did not observe it was beaten with many stripes; but he that knew it not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall receive few stripes." Why is this? Because he did not commit sin through malice, or with a free will, and it is only by free will alone man can be damned. I say you are not a heretic, but an apostate. In saying this, however, let it not be supposed that I mean you individually, but the church to which you belong; for we are commanded to judge no one (one which I shall willingly obey) except those who depart from among us, and wilfully abandon the truth. The just man falls seven times a day. How can he be just if he falls seven times; for surely, if he lose God's favour, it cannot be that he is so? But is it not clear that it implies he is guilty of those minor transgressions which do not deprive him of God's grace, but which are the natural result of human weakness? I myself have committed venial sins in laughing at you during this discussion for the many blunders you have made, and so have you, although you canonize your-

selves as saints before you are dead at all. I must say, Sir, that you have been guilty of blasphemy this day, as gross as ever proceeded from the mouth of any man. I have heard myself of a man in Wolverhampton, who was about dying, getting his grave-stone made, on which he caused to be engraved "Victory—victory; I have been saved through the death of Jesus Christ." Mr. Maguire continued—Was this man inspired, that he knew his salvation was at hand?

Mr. Gregg.—He had the grace of the Holy Ghost.

Mr. Maguire.—Then he was infallible—just as you are in finding out the Scriptures. I believe in Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost as well as you do; but I am not so presumptuous as to predict my salvation, and to account myself worthy of seeing God my Saviour. Oh no, no, there is not a man, woman, or child fit for heaven now, or who presumes to think they are saved, but fanatics, because the idea enters into their crazy imaginations. St. Paul was not assured of his salvation when he said that "No man knew whether he was worthy of love or hatred." Sir, I know the difference between presumption and holy hope. If you used the word hope, it might not go down with certain people---gulls, as I must call them; but, Sir, I again tell you, you are guilty of blasphemy, and that you are told by St. Paul, "Let him who stands take care lest he fall." It is not to preach, or to get up an exhibition, we came here. You cannot go on with this children's play—this mockery, I will call it—before the most enlightened auditory perhaps in the whole world. One would imagine you could work miracles. Your language is the same as if you were bringing the Holy Spirit down from heaven, and you wish that certain persons should understand you are an inspired man. I can understand you; but that will not go down with men of common sense, men of well-regulated minds, and who have received a proper education. You say the Unitarian cannot be saved. I tell you your church is the cause of it. You gloss the Scriptures, and so does he; both of you give it your own interpretation; pray who is to decide between you? You say there is a unity in the Trinity—he replies, mathematically, how can there be one in three and three in one? and he will also tell you that the Father must of necessity have suffered with the Son, and the Holy Ghost with both. You cannot complain of this---why? because your church at first preached the right of private judgment as a reason for going out of the Church of Rome—a church which you so loudly called upon your hearers to come out of.

Mr. Gregg.—It was not me, but the Lord.

Mr. Maguire.—The Church of Christ was established for 1,400 years, until the right of private judgment sought to overwhelm her. You say that the Scriptures are interpreted rightly by you, and is according to the public judgment of your church. The Unitarian denies that; and who will decide? Was it not the principle of the early reformers to interpret the Scriptures as they thought proper? I have at last caught you on some tangible point, and I stake my literary character, such as it is, to this great meeting, that I will demonstrate, as clear as the sun at noon day, that the present head of the Roman Catholic Church is the successor of St. Peter in direct succession—that the Church of Rome cannot be apostate; that she is governed by the holy Spirit of God, and that the Pope is and ever has been the centre of Christian unity. I will prove this from the authority of Protestant writers alone—from Bishop Newton, from May, from Whittaker, Faber, and several others, who

quarrel and differ from each other, but agree in one respect as to the succession of the See of Rome to that of St. Peter. The reverend gentleman then read a long extract from Faber's Difficulties of Romanism, and his half hour being concluded, he sat down.

It was then two o'clock—when the Rev. Mr. Nangle said that both parties agreed the discussion should be adjourned till this day.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—Although I am to be the plaintiff to-morrow, yet I wish to waive any right I may possess, in order to give Mr. Gregg an opportunity of proving the apostacy of the Church of Rome, as I wish to have the question settled for ever.

Mr. GREGG.—It would be very inconvenient to begin a subject like that, when, perhaps, we should be obliged to terminate it in an hour or so.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—I'll give you the whole day, if you wish,

Mr. GREGG.—Very well—then I shall go on with it in the morning.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—If you please.

The assembly then adjourned to next day.

FOURTH DAY.

FRIDAY, June 1st, 1838.

The discussion between the Rev. Mr. Maguire and the Rev. Mr. Gregg was continued this day, being the fourth day; and, as if the thirst for polemics could not be satiated by the duration, the most intense sensation existed amongst the crowded audience. The demonstrations of feeling were much more numerous than on the preceding day, as the partizans of Mr. Gregg, foremost among whom was the Rev. Mr. Nolan, broke out into frequent ebullitions against the Catholic champion, which repeatedly called for the interference of the chair.

When the usual hour (eleven) had arrived, Mr. Maguire rose and said ..I call on Mr. Gregg to proceed with his proofs that the Church of Rome is the Church of Anti-Christ

Mr. GREGG.—I am rather astonished at this call, after the agreement we entered into last night; and after some conversation I had with the reverend gentleman a few minutes ago. I cannot consent, by commencing, to sacrifice my last half hour, which is most important. But if he consents to allow me my last half hour, I am quite willing to commence. I this moment agreed with him, at least so I understood it, that I was not to lose my last half hour. I, being the attacking party, would labour under great disadvantage if I had not an opportunity for rejoinder. He said he would continue upon the apostacy; and as he has my arguments of yesterday to reply to, I could subsequently proceed with fresh proofs.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—Your total mistake of my meaning, Sir, shows the necessity of a witness to any conversation between us. I said to you that if I allowed you to commence and conclude to-day, you would have three half hours for my one—the one half hour with which you closed yesterday, the half hour commencing to-day, and the half hour closing

the proceedings. If I commenced to-day, what would I have to reply to? You have entered into no proofs, and I have nothing to answer. Our agreement yesterday was that you should proceed with your case. I appeal to the public if it was not so.

Mr. GREGG—I, too, appeal to the public. If I choose to insist upon my right, I could make Mr. Maguire go on; but I don't ask that: I am quite willing to commence, if I am allowed my concluding turn.

Mr. MAGUIRE—It is better to leave the matter to the chair.

Mr. GREGG—I am quite willing to leave it to the chair. And I am sure the decision will be in my favour.

Mr. MAGUIRE—You should not prejudge the decison, if you are willing to submit to it.

[There was here loud cries of chair, chair, from all parts of the room, and hisses from Mr. GREGG's friends.]

Mr. MAGUIRE—"In your patience, you should possess your souls."

Mr. GREGG—I claim to be allowed to finish my address to the public. Now, mark—I commenced an attack upon the apostacy of the Roman Catholic church yesterday. I proved that apostacy to demonstration, from Daniel. Mr. Maguire made no reply. The reason is clear enough. He went home to consider it. Therefore, it is most unreasonable that I should be called upon, at any inconvenience, and out of our usual routine, to proceed and lose the advantage of the closing reply. He has a fair opportunity of upsetting all I have said of his church now if he can.

Mr. MAGUIRE—I would be perfectly satisfied and ought to be satisfied with this course, if we had not entered into an arrangement yesterday. What necessity was there for a specific arrangement, if every thing was to go *pari passu* with the regular course of things? I agreed yesterday, that he was to get leave to go on with his apostacy case. Stopping, as we did, yesterday an hour earlier than the day before, he had not concluded it, and I was willing to give him an hour, or even a whole day, for the purpose.

Mr. GREGG—We stopped early, to oblige Mr. Maguire.

After some further conversation, it was agreed that things should go on in their usual course, Mr. Maguire commencing.

Mr. MAGUIRE began by saying—My chairman has recommended me, rather than give up this discussion, to forfeit my claim upon our agreement, and I shall do so for peace-sake, Permit me, commencing, to observe, that if artifical and capricious glosses upon the prophets could carry my friend to an apparent victory, there is no doubt that he would not have failed for want of assertions. But I will show him that his glossing is his own; I will prove to him incontrovertibly that Protestant glossers look upon every man who holds his opinions as either a knave or a fool (there was here great confusion, and mingled hisses and cheers.)

The Rev. Mr. NANGLE came forward, and requested there should be no marks either of approbation or disapprobation. Such conduct, he said, was a violation of the terms of agreement between the contending parties.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I beg my friends to show no symptoms of approbation. I want none. I seek their attention, and nothing more. The great question we have to decide could be concluded on my part in twenty minutes. But I will go into it at length, and leave no cavil unanswered. I will have first to make an observation or two upon his last speech yesterday; but three minutes will suffice for it. He first quoted

a text from St. John, to prove that every sin is mortal. He read, "There is a sin unto death." I hope the oversight was unintentional; but my friends, he omitted what the holy evangelist continues to say, "There is a sin not unto death"—that is, there is a sin that killeth the soul in a spiritual manner, and there is a sin that killeth not the soul in a spiritual manner. Now, either this proves venial sin, or, as I will prove to a demonstration, it shows the necessity for prayers for the dead. I will go no further on this subject now; but if my friend chooses to touch upon it again, I will leave nothing I have promised unproved. He next spoke of the book of Maccabees, which, he says, was rejected from the canonical Scriptures, because it sanctioned self-murder. But I deny that it sanctions self-murder. It says that Maccabeus chose rather to die nobly than fall into the hands of his enemies. But the dying nobly had reference to what was passing in his own mind, and not to the opinion of the inspired writer. He died nobly, in his own opinion; but his mode of death is not sanctioned. But if the book is to be rejected because it relates an historical fact, why not reject that book, too, which tells us that Jeptha slew his own daughter? and that one which relates of Sampson pulling down the pillars of the temple of the Philistines, killing himself and many others. Now, I take the octavo edition of the Bible, published at Oxford, which cannot be rejected, it being a great Protestant authority; and, on the authority of this book, I will show that a great feast was established in honour of the self-sacrificial act of Maccabeus, with an octave of eight days. It is said in the 10th chapter of St. John, that our Saviour and his disciples went up the mountain to this feast, and in the margin we find a note referring us to the passage of the Book of Maccabees; and on going to that part of the Book of Maccabees, we are there referred back, in the margin, to the text of St. John; clearly proving that the commentator held the connection between the texts which I have shown. If, then, the Maccabees be not a canonical book, why was this feast established on its authority? and how will it be said that Jesus gave his countenance to a superstition? I ask Mr. Gregg what authority he has for rejecting the book of the Maccabees? None, but his own private authority. What authority has he for condemning the Arians? None, but his own. Again, what authority has he for condemning the Unitarians? His own private authority alone. Why did he condemn the Rev. Mr. Burgh? Because he differed from him on the meaning of the Book of Daniel. Did the Catholic Church ever condemn any person without a trial? No, neither Luther, nor Wickliff, nor Huss was held guilty without having an opportunity of making defence. But my reverend friend, because he looks grave, and wears a pair of spectacles, I suppose, deals about condemnation with a more unsparing hand than ever did the maligned Vatican. You will observe that in one of the gospels, it is expressly said of the blessed Virgin, "Behold, from henceforth, all nations shall call thee blessed." How was this promise to be fulfilled? Where were the nations to call her holy, and to hold her name blessed, when the whole Christian world was sunk in dark, and dismal, and damnable heresy for 800 years? Now, my friends, I shall proceed to show, that the Babylon spoken of in the Revelations is not the Church of Rome, and that the city is not the Christian city, nor the papal city, but pagan Rome. Saint Peter wrote to the elect Church of the co-elect, which is in Babylon. Now, he was presiding over the Christian Church, which was in Rome at the time; and he could only

have spoken of it as in Babylon, because among the heathens. Indeed Dr. Hammond, a celebrated Protestant commentator takes this view of it. (The reverend gentleman here read an extract from Hammond, in which he holds that the vision of St. John, in the Revelations, referred to heathen Rome, and that the hallelujahs of the nations were the joy of the people at seeing the Christian church overcome it.) Thus the fall of Babylon was the fall of the pagan city of Rome, and the joy of the nations was for the conversion of it, or, as Dr Hammond writes, for the conversion of pagan to Christian Rome. But I will ask Mr. Gregg, if he does know of another city situated upon seven hills besides Rome ? Mark what Dr. Heyland says in his Cosmography--Dr. Heyland whom no one will doubt, as a learned and grave authority. (The reverend gentleman here read an extract from this work, in which it was stated that Constantinople was built upon seven hills, each of which was crowned by a mosque, or some other public edifice ; and on the seventh of which was seated the temple of St. Sophia. Hence it was called the city on seven hills.) Mr. Gregg will travel far before he will show that Constantinople was not the Babylon foretold. It was called Nova Roma, or New Rome, and has quite as clear a title to be called the Babylon; so that if there be any mystery in the number seven, and if Babylon the Great be situated on seven hills, it is more likely, as Doctor Heyland observes, that the Grand Turk, the professed enemy of Christ, should be the Anti-Christ ; and, it would be more reasonable to look for him in the temple of Saint Sophia, which is now a Turkish mosque, than in St. Peter's at Rome, which is still a Christian temple. I have already shown that Faber differs from Newton, and declares that Joseph Meade and Bishop Newton are wrong in the application of the term Babylon the Great. To proceed—idolatry was not entirely rooted out until the fifth century. It still uplifted its head even under Constantine the Great, and it was only under Theodosius that it was completely quelled. Well, according to St. John, the devil was to be chained with all manner of chains for a thousand years after the fall of Paganism.—This will bring us, as I shall hereafter show, to the time of Luther and Calvin, when hell was again let loose upon the world. [The reverend gentleman then read another extract from Doctor Hammond, who held that the meaning of the passage in Revelations about the angel sent to chain down Satan, meant that the imprisonment of the arch enemy should continue for a thousand years after the fall of Paganism. The writer went on to show that paganism continued to the invasion of the Goths, when the city of Rome was destroyed, and Christianity became victorious.] Our blessed Saviour forewarned us that he would send his lambs amongst wolves ; and did he not suffer his lambs to be persecuted under Valerian, Domitian, Caligula, Nero, and the other scourges and tyrants, which were foretold, till the patience and meekness of the followers of Christ overcame the persecution in 445, when Paganism was destroyed? Was it not the Roman Catholic church that overcame the Pagans and idolators ? And was not the Pope then in Rome, and is he not there still ? [The reverend gentleman then read an extract from Doctor Cave a Protestant writer, to show that he held that the Babylon referred to in Revelations was pagan Rome] Now then, having given you these proofs, in refutation of Mr. Gregg, I will not at present proceed to show that Luther is the fallen star referred to by St. John. [Mr. Maguire next referred to Whiston, a Protestant writer in the reign of Queen Anne, who held that the Pope was Anti-Christ,

and prophesied and proclaimed that Popery would be done away with in the year 1716.] If (continued Mr. Maguire amidst great laughter) the prophecy has been fulfilled, I am content to submit to his authority. Now, to proceed to his quotations about forbidding to marry, and to eat meat. The Protestant church acknowledges the general council of Chalcedon. It was admittted by the first parliament under Queen Bess. Now, one of the canons of that council declares that any priest or monk who marries shall be publicly excommunicated. You have your own church admitting that council which forbids to marry, and marrying in contradiction to it. We have the authority of St. Paul for believing that the married disciple is more ready to fall away from the faith than he who is single. But I will proceed to show that the prophecy did not refer to the Catholic church. The Gnostics and other early heretics, my reverend friend must know, totally forbid marriage, saying it was brought in by the devil, and that marriage was fornication. The same doctrine was held by the Marcionites, who said there were two principles in human nature, the evil and the good, and that marriage proceeded from the evil. With these the Encratites and the Manicheans forbid the use of flesh. Some of them held that swine's flesh only was objectionable. But many of the early heretics declared that all flesh was an evil. [The reverend gentleman then quoted Tertullian to show that the Marcionites regarded marriage as evil.] But does the Catholic church do this? No. It has elevated marriage to a sacrament. Nor do we forbid the use of meat. We use it, and I can tell you we are very glad to get it. We only hold that during times of penance, the use of all kinds of meat is not advisable, for which we might plead the line of Horace—

"Sine cerere et Bacho frigit Venus."

We know that eating and drinking luxuriously foment the worst passions, and that a cessation from them is necessary to penance.

Mr. Maguire's half-hour ended here.

Mr. Gregg then rose and said—I beg leave to ask my reverend friend where did he get all his wisdom about the Scriptures? or whether was it the voice of Rome, or a voice from Leitrim, or Ballinamore, that we have been listening to for the last half hour? Was it the voice of Legion or the voice of the Rev. Mr. Maguire himself? I would be glad to know is he quite sure that he has given the true interpretation, or whether that interpretation is his own, or that of his church. I don't care which he may choose—it is all the same to me. If it has come from Rome, it is all the same as if it came from himself, for, he being the child of Rome, it is quite right that he should copy after his parent. He says he is consistent. Now, I say that I am consistent, and truly consistent. I am a true Catholic; I belong to the holy Catholic Church of England and Ireland, as it is, and as it always has been; for I say, and I have already proved, that the present United Church of England and Ireland has been always the same church in these countries, and that it is the same now that it was when Christianity was first established here and in England. I will read for you an extract from Magna Charta, which shows that the Christian Church in England was the same then that it is now; that she enjoyed the same religious liberty then that she does now. Our church is the Church of Ireland as established by the Apostles. I do admit that St. Patrick came from Rome, and that he preached the gospel here; but he did so before Rome was fallen, and sunk in the grossest idolatry and superstition. He came from Rome when Rome was respectable, and

not when she was the mother of harlots and of the abominations of the earth. He came from her before she became the apostate harlot. But what has she done since? She has, since her fall, which has been plainly foretold in the Revelations, and which I shall come to by-and-bye, sent us missioners not of peace and truth, but of crime and dissension, which have made us the mock and jest of all the nations of the world: and oh, my Roman Catholic friends, I tell you in affection that you will be so until you come out of her into the true holy Catholic Church in all its poverty and simplicity, as it was first established by Christ and his apostles. My reverend friend said, when I produced this map the other day, that he thought it was the Falls of Niagara: well; it will answer his purpose perhaps to call it the fall of Rome, and I shall this day treat him to another view of it. The reverend gentleman referred to the downfall of pagan Rome, and would have you believe that Constantinople is the Babylon spoken of in the Revelations. He did that which I think was not fair, and he must now suffer the awful consequences of it. He read you a portion of the text, without reading you the context; and, my friends, when you hear it all read, you will see how impossible it is that Constantinople can be meant, or that the church of St. Sophia, which is a Mahomedan mosque, can be the temple to which he directed your attention. You will see, from this text, a description of the struggle that was going on in the church between those who were true to the faith, and those who had corrupted it with their crimes and abominations. Michael and his angels fought with the devil and his angels. Here, from the 12th chapter of Revelations, is a description of Rome when sunk in her abominations: "And there appeared a wonder in heaven, and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon these crowns were written the names of blasphemy, and his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth; and the dragon stood before the woman who was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born. And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron, and her child was called up to God and to his throne, and the woman fled into the wilderness, where she had a place prepared by God, and that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days." Yes, my friends, the true Church, the primitive Christians, were banished into the wilderness by the crimes and abominations of Rome, but she did not cease to exist. She was preserved by God, and by the blood of the Lamb. And the text goes on to say, "There was war in heaven—Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon fought, and his angels, and prevailed not, neither was there place found any more in heaven; and the great dragon was cast out—that old servant called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world; he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him. And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, 'Now is come salvation and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of Christ; for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night: and they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the testimony, for they loved not their lives unto death.'" Yes, my Roman Catholic friends, the true servants of God overcame, by the blood of the Lamb, and by love, as I expect to overcome you, and to awaken you to a sense of the awful errors in which you are plunged. The text goes on to say, "Rejoice ye heavens, and ye that

dwell in them. Woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth and the sea, for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." Thus the devil attacked the church as he formerly attacked Christ himself. He attacked Christ by temptation and then by force; but he reversed that order with the church; for he first attacked the church by force and failed, and then attacked her by temptation and prevailed. But what became of the woman? The woman banished to the wilderness was, as I have remarked, the true church. She was persecuted for the mysterious time of 1,260 days or years mentioned in the text. The beast is again described as a leopard, beautiful in outward appearance, but cruel, deceitful, and treacherous, as is the church of Rome and her institutions. Thus stood forth the monstrous beast, which he says is Constantinople. But mark, my friends, the evil of stopping short, without reading farther to arrive at the true meaning of the context. It is said in the Book of the Proverbs that he who answers a man before he hears him is guilty of folly and shame. It is so with my reverend friend. Again I want to know whether it is with Rome or Leitrim I have to argue. My reverend friend quoted a great many Protestant authorities, but what care I for individual opinion. He quoted Dr. Heyland. Well, Dr. Heyland has different opinions, and so has Dr. Gregg; and Dr. Gregg will stand against Dr. Heyland, who forgot his church when he wrote some things. I did not bind up my hands and surrender my will to the bishop. I do not care a pin for the doctors; I am one myself, and I hope to be a distinguished one. Here the rev. gentleman read the 33d Homily, on obedience, and in proceeding to do so he said—I will put on my spectacles, and read for my reverend friend what he will not like to hear. I am waxing old, and do not belong to the corporation of bachelors. I have a family of children, and I am sure no one thinks me the worse man on that account. Now, what does my reverend friend say to this? What does he say to this bull of excommunication? I say it is a dangerous roaring bull, and that it is a murdering bull, which has produced anarchy, and war, and bloodshed upon the earth. Will he say the power was from Christ, when the Pope put the kingdoms of the earth under anathema? How dreadful were the consequences, and how like were they to anything that could result from the mild, the pure, and holy doctrines of the primitive Christian church? I will now read for my reverend friend the 43d Homily on idolatry. (Here the rev. gentleman read an extract.) He then proceeded to say—Will Mr. Maguire stand up in defence of the adoration of sticks and stones, and senseless images? My reverend opponent told his hearers about a great many names, for which the people cared not a straw. It was not what Faber said, what Dr. Heyland said, what Whistone said, or what any man said—the question was what did God say? Mr. Maguire speaks of Constantinople as the great city mentioned in the Revelations. How, I would ask him, can that apply? do the Turks forbid marriage? No. He said Luther recommended ten wives—why, the Turks went farther, they allowed fifty or sixty wives, or as many as a man can keep. Here the reverend gentleman read another extract from Revelations, and continued by saying—now, Rev. Sir, see the advantage you would have gained, if you had read the whole text. I say that it is here clearly shown that the Roman Catholic church is the pagan church of Rome mentioned in the text — that it is Rome, with all the

abominations of paganism revived. I will ask my reverend friend, and I think he will answer the question in the negative—How can he say that Constantinople, or the Turkish empire, is a continuation of the empire of Alexander the Great? The Pagan Rome mentioned in the Apocalypse is clearly a continuation of the Roman empire. And what childishness it is to endeavour to make Constantinople and the Turkish dominions the Pagan Rome mentioned in the Scriptures. I deplore that such a man as Mr. Maguire should be driven to such straits. Can anything be so pagan as the practices of the Church of Rome? Is it not pagan to give beads to men to pray with? We give beads to children to amuse them; and those trumpery are given to the professors of the Popish creed to amuse them and lead them off from the truths which are to be found in the gospels of the living God. I grant you that the Popish dominion at one time nearly overran the earth, and had liberty and religion trodden under foot, and is it not quite consistent with the description given of it in the Apocalypse? He has brought forward the differences amongst Protestant writers as a proof that the Spirit of Truth cannot be amongst them. I draw from those differences quite contrary conclusions; and I will show you that I am right. Now, Mr. Maguire will, no doubt, exercise his wit—for there is no man better at a jest—at my saying that I prove the truth of our religion from the differences which occasionally arose amongst its teachers. He will say—oh, there is a theologian for you, who undertakes to prove that differences in religion are a sign of truth. I say, that they are conducive to truth. I ask you, my friends, is it not to be hoped that the differences here between Mr. Maguire and myself will lead to truth. The prophet Daniel says many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be multiplied. It is by making experiments that truth shall be established. It is those differences that have led me and led you, my friends, to the truth. Had the rev. gentleman read the book correctly, he would have answered me differently. It is from those differences which arise upon inquiry after the truth that I have derived the admirable system of assaulting the greatest enemy to human happiness that the world or society ever saw—that is the Church of Rome (partial applause from a portion of the audience). Mr. Maguire says that the Church of Rome is not the great apostacy, and that the Pope is not Anti-Christ. Now, those are the questions which we have under consideration, and I undertake to prove them to the mind of any man who will listen to argument and the truth. He accuses me of presumption, assurance, and almost blasphemy, when I say, humbly before my God, that I have the Spirit of Truth with me. Now, I will go farther, and say that I could put my hand upon a hundred humble men—cobblers, tailors, tinkers, and so-forth—who have the Spirit of God with them. Can that Spirit be traced to the Pope, to the Grand Lama of modern paganism? Mr. Maguire objects to the word spirit. I say we, who belong to the true Church, have the spirit with us; and, brethren, I here call on you and implore you to stick to that Church in which is life, and truth, and happiness. He quoted Faber as a Protestant authority, to show that the Pope was not Anti-Christ, because he did not deny the faith of Christ. I don't care what any man asserts—and that was a mere assertion. If a man asserts a thing to which all the senses give the lie, he is not to be believed. If I say that this sheet of paper is black, I deny that it is white. I ask you is it not so?

Mr. Maguire—If all was as clear as that we could have no difference.

Mr. Gregg—I will make my proposition quite as plain. If a man tells me that the Church of Rome is not idolatrous and opposed to Christ; am I to believe him when he tells me at the same moment that she calls upon her followers to believe that the eternal God is cased in this little box? [Here the reverend gentleman produced something like a snuff-box.] Am I to believe a man who will tell me that the Church of Rome is not opposed to Christ, while he says at the same time that God has reduced himself into that position that would render him odious and contemptible in the eyes of mankind (applause from some of his hearers)? Forgive me, my friends, it is hard to talk upon such subjects, but I am defending the truth and I must speak it. [Here the reverend gentleman held the box up to the view of the crowd.] His half hour having ended,

The Rev. Mr. Maguire rose and said—My friends, I shall endeavour to run over the wide course which my rev. opponent has taken, just for the mere purpose of rendering it difficult, if not altogether impossible, for me to follow him, or to connect so much matter into the small space of half an hour. But I tell him I am accustomed to do a great deal in that time. What shall I begin with? I shall begin with the argument as to the possibility of putting God into a box. I ask him was not Christ on the Cross, and when he was, was not God confined to that spot? I ask him was not Christ in the room with Pontius Pilate, and during that time was not the Godhead confined there too? If not, then was our Saviour a mere man? I ask, when our Saviour says, holding out the bread, "This is my body," will he say he is a liar? Will he say to him—"It is not your body; I don't believe it; it is only a sign of your body?" as if the words of the Most High are to be judged by us. And from whom does this doctrine come? From the devil. Luther says he got it from a ghost in the night, but that he did not know whether it was black or white. The Jew will have an argument against your religion; in your thus calling to account the Word of God, and confining its meaning to what comes within the range of your own limited capacities. I tell you, Sir, you have no right to pronounce upon God's words that such is their meaning, because you cannot understand the one that is most obvious. You admit that there is something more than the mere bread and wine in the sacrament. If there be not, why do you gull, and humbug, and deceive the people by saying that there is? If there be something more, I will thank you to tell me what it is. Let me ask you, when Christ entered the door of the room where the apostles were assembled, after His Resurrection, was not God in that room? I tell you, Sir, God is in your pocket this moment. God is everywhere. Nowhere is there a vacuum for him. Now, gentlemen, mind the dishonest charge; not that he intended it as such—I am sure he did not—he has brought against me. He tells you that I wanted to make out that Faber was on my side. Now, I don't want to show any such thing. I don't care on what side he is. I quoted him to show that all the Protestant writers on the Prophecies, as well as Mr. Gregg himself, differed in opinion, and that not one of them knew what they were doing, or the meaning of a single verse in the Revelations, and they confused rather than threw any light upon them. I quoted Gregg against Faber, and Faber against Gregg; I quoted Grotius, and many other divines, and now, Sir, you turn round on me and say they were no Churchmen. Oh, no, they were no Churchmen, because they had too much common sense and too much Christian charity to hold

that nineteen-twentieths of the inhabitants of the world were damnable idolators. They were not mad—they did not require straight-waistcoats, nor did they ever make such an exhibition as you made yesterday, when you roared, and thumped, and stamped, and were near being dumb from inspiration. You talk to me of tailors, and nailers, and sailors; and you say that they know as much of the true religion, and of the Scriptures, as the cardinals of our Church. The cardinals are, I think you will admit, some of the most learned men in the whole world; and I tell you that neither your tailors, nor your nailers, nor your sailors, nor yourself, can know one single word of the Scriptures. I tell you that you cannot prove their authenticity—you know not that they are correct. Why? Because you have not the Syriac language in which they were originally written; you have only a smattering of Hebrew. Let me ask you do you know the Hebrew without points? Under these circumstances, how can you know that the Scriptures which you have are the true Scriptures? You cannot know it. You may tell me you know it by the Church. I ask you what can the Church know about them during the eight hundred years, or more, for which she was invisible? Your Church never was in existence before the days of Luther and Calvin. It therefore never had the Scriptures before them. I have challenged you repeatedly to tell me what Church, what man, or set of men, ever believed in or heard of the Thirty-nine Articles, previous to the reign of Elizabeth? I say, no Church. Therefore your Church invented the Twenty-two negative Articles. My reverend friend next went to other subjects. He came once more to beads, and relics, and miracles. He tells me he has the Spirit. Now, there is not a single liar or humbugger, whose object is to fool mankind, that does not say the same. Now, if I were to boast as loudly as he does, that I have the Spirit (and, indeed, I have a much better right to do so than he), it would at once be said, and justly, that I wanted to impose on you. If he has the Spirit, let him show me that he has, and I will believe him; but, until then, I cannot help thinking that it is rank nonsense. He told you that disagreements and differences as to matters of religion only served to confirm the truth, and he quoted the words of the prophet Daniel to support his position. He mentioned that they applied to the faithful hiding from Anti-Christ; but I say they were not. They meant, as St. Paul meant the words, "They were driven to and fro, and rocked about by every wind of doctrine." What, is it to be said that being driven about by every wind of doctrine is a confirmation of the truth? Then the more difference as to religion—the more Ranters, the more Socinians, the more Jumpers, the more Muggletonians we have, the more will the truth be confirmed. Next, my friend turned to the invisibility of the Church. Oh! why did he remind me again of that question. I had wished for his sake to be done with it. When I pushed for an explanation of his belief on that point, he spoke at one time of its visibility, then of its invisibility, then of both; then he staggered and returned to the invisibility again. I asked him then if the Church were invisible, how could it be Catholic? He did not tell me. He quoted against me the Book of Revelations, but I tell him that neither he nor any one else knows any thing about it, or will know, till the Prophecies it contains are accomplished. He quoted the text about the two witnesses. Now, he knows, as well as I know, that these two witnesses have not come yet; that they will not come till the days of Anti-Christ, and that they are Enoch and Elias, who

are to be restored to life, to preach the doctrine of truth to the Jews, who, in those days, will once more be brought within the pale of the Church. He knows, as well as I know, that Anti-Christ has not come yet, and that he will not come till fire has fallen from heaven, and till there are other awful and visible signs of his approach, and I will prove to him that the "time, and times, and half a time" which he is to reign will be but a period of three years and a half, and I will earnestly beg your attention while I demonstrate that the Pope, or the continuation of Popes, is not and cannot be Anti-Christ. I will retain this demonstration for the last half hour, and if I don't prove it, and convince every one in the room that is not wilfully blind, of the truth of my argument, I will be content to give up the discussion, and carry it no further. My rev. friend has asked, is it not the greatest nonsense that St. Sophia, in Constantinople, should be taken as having any thing whatsoever to do with the part of the Revelations relative to the beast with seven heads and ten horns. Why I beg leave to remind him that I do not give that as my own opinion, but as the opinion of Dr. Heyland, Dr. Hammond, and other Protestant writers. I have their word, their honour, and their consciences for the fact. I take it upon their word, and it is little matter what my own private opinion might be if I exercised it; and yet, notwithstanding the authorities which I quote, you tell me that my assertions are childish, while you yourself have scarcely given me anything since the commencement of the discussion but bare unsupported assertions. I agree with you, Sir, in reprobating the man who attempts to give his own words for the words of God; and I charge you, Sir, with doing so. You give me your own gloss. You tell me you have the word of God; prove it to me, and then I will believe you. You tell me that our Saviour, Jesus Christ, had not in the world a single being to glorify his name, to kneel to him suffering on the cross of Calvary, or to give honour to him by his life for 800 years or more, and yet Christ promised that his church should last for ever. Is not that giving me your own words for the words of God? Oh, that will stick in your throat; and remember I tell you that it will draw upon you the judgment of God unless you repent. Oh, I wish you would do what on a former occasion I advised another to do. Sir, let me ask you did you ever read Dr. Middleton's "Free Inquiry?" This now is coming to my proofs. Dr. Middleton undertakes to prove that no single miracle has been performed from the time of the apostles up to the present day. Yet we know from the scriptures that miracles will be performed by the Anti-Christ, and that the devil will be let loose for the performance thereof. But Dr. Middleton, a Protestant divine, says none have been wrought since the days of the apostles: therefore Anti-Christ has not come, and therefore the Pope is not Anti-Christ. So much, therefore, for your interpretation of the scriptures. At one time you will not give a straw for the church. "Pooh," say you, "my hands were not tied; I was not given to the church, bound neck and heels." At another time you become—oh! how orthodox—and cry out to your brethren, to stick by the church; no matter what may come to pass, not to leave it. The fact of it is, you are so puzzled how to make out your cause that you actually do not know what course to steer. It is said of Anti-Christ and his followers that he will overrun and conquer the whole world, and on this account many excellent Protestant divines were of opinion that Napoleon was the Anti-Christ, and you, Sir, I suppose, are aware that it was the opinion of Faber that France in the days of her

infidelity, was the apostacy mentioned in the Revelations.—We are told that they shall not buy or sell with us, and that those of the true church will fly into the wilderness. Why, if that be a mark of the true church God knows we have it in poor Ireland. Oh! we were hunted into the wilderness, and persecuted with the bitterest persecution; and, if that be a mark of the true church, it is certainly here. And I will show by-and-bye who were the locusts that swarmed the land when the bottomless pit was opened, and who drove these locusts from the land. He says that some of my proofs might do very well for arguments in Ballinamore, where the people were not accustomed to hear much reason; but I tell him that the people of Ballinamore are accustomed to common sense. They don't pretend there to have the spirit as my reverend friend has —they have no jumping there. Why, when he fancied that he had got the spirit yesterday, and jumped nearly seven feet high, I would have called it a miracle if he had not got mute! Well, was ever any man so confounded as he was when he spoke of the Magna Charta? Where, I ask you, Dr. Gregg—where was the Protestant church when Magna Charta was granted? Oh, it was not then heard of—the locusts were not then let loose—hell had not then been opened! Oh those were the Good old Popish times! It was by the sanction of the bishops—of the very Popish bishops—that the imposing character was given to the demand of the people which awed the tyrannical king into submission; and yet there had not yet been one word about the Protestant church. Why, Mr. Gregg, if you go on in that wild way you never will be promoted. I am endeavouring to hold you up to the world as a man of talent and common sense, but you will not allow me. If I quote the ablest Protestant divines, you say you don't care a pin for their authority—your own is quite as good. You rely entirely on the authority of your church, but if I quote my church, oh, what do you care for it; and if I give my own authority, why you care less for that—that is only Ballinamore logic. You despise all the learned and most able divines that ever your church produced when I quote them against you; you say they are worth nothing. I appeal to any reasonable man if it would be possible to produce any *argumentum ad hominem* superior to such authority. If you were to bring a host of the holy Fathers or of the doctors of my church against me, would I treat them in that manner? You fling Jeremy Taylor, and Hammond, and Cave, and Grotius, and the whole of them, to the winds, if they do not agree with your views. Why, man, do you imagine that their united wisdom and learning does not weigh more than all the brains in your little head (cries of shame, shame, from renegade Nolan, and great confusion, caused by the uproar of Mr. Gregg's partizans)? Some one wrote to me, I suppose at Mr. Gregg's request, to induce me not to use the Holy Fathers at this discussion; for my part, I will never yield up the Holy Fathers; but you see what mercy I have shown him; for I have not produced one of them against him. However, I confute him out of the mouths of his own best and wisest doctors. He pretends to bring the most convincing arguments of the apostacy of the Church of Rome from the Apocalypse; Now, I tell him that he does not understand one word of the Apocalypse; and I say, further, that there is not one lady or gentleman in England, Ireland, or Scotland, whatever influence of the spirit they may pretend to, who understands one word of the Apocalypse—nor do I, or any divine in my church pretend to understand it. But what is it my rev. friend quotes the Apocalypse to prove? Why, it is that all our ancestors, and his an-

cestors, for a period of many centuries, are damned in the bottomless pit! He wants to prove by it that those who gave Christianity to our country, and preserved it there in triumph, are damned in eternal fire! What a dutiful son of the old church is he! I have already shown that those who condemned marriage, and the eating of flesh meat, &c., and who were pointed out in the phrophecies, were the ancient heretics, the Marcionites, and Manicheans, and Priscillians, &c., and that it is to them that the Apostle refers in the passage quoted by my rev. friend. I can show you, on the authority of Protestant doctors, that the Manicheans condemned marriage as the invention of the devil, while we, guided by the Word of God, have raised it to the dignity of a sacrament. Here we have a letter from St. Leo, a Pope, even one of our Popes, where he speaks in language of condemnation of those doctrines of the Heretics. Only think of a Pope condemning those who forbid marriage! Well, so much for your gloss of the sacred Scripture on those subjects—so much for your lucid interpretation of the Apocalypse. Mr. Maguire's half hour here ended.

Mr. Gregg—My friends, if I am overtaken during this discussion in any expression of harshness or personality against my rev. friend, I will be satisfied to take it as a mark that I am in the wrong; I may laugh at him sometimes, and I hope I may be permitted to do so; but I will give him leave to use all the personalities he may please against me. Having promised so much, I will proceed to take up some of the points which he has made in his speech, and they are numerous and complicated enough. I will first take the Magna Charta. Now, I deny that our ancestors gained the Magna Charta because they acted as Protestants; and when King John appealed to the Pope, the kingdom was laid under an interdict to compel the people to submit to the tyrant; but, like true Protestants, they preferred remaining under the spiritual deprivation, and setting the see of Rome at defiance, rather than yield. Thus it was a primitive bursting out of the spirit of Protestantism that obtained the Magna Charta. But, what a miserable charter was that compared with the glorious liberty which we now enjoy in those countries. The liberties which we enjoy at present incomparably excel those conferred by the Magna Charta, and my rev. friend himself feels it. I ask does such liberty exist in Italy? Ah! the great long blessed sword would soon settle me in that case; it would soon convert me from a wolf to a lamb—it would not leave me a word to say. I ask Mr. Maguire is there free discussion in Italy, aye, or in any other country where the Romish Church prevails? Let him answer me that. I defy him to reply in the affirmative. Where is there liberty in such countries as we enjoy in Protestant England? O, let my rev. friend be rather more careful for the future, when he tells us of liberty coming from Popery. I give this word of friendly advice; and, you know, a word to the wise—He says, that miracles will be performed by Anti-Christ—

Mr. Maguire—False miracles.

Mr. Gregg—Aye, false miracles; and it is for that reason that I say the Church of Rome is Anti-Christ; it is from her false miracles, which are calculated to deceive and lead astray the sheep from the fold of Christ that I say she is the church of Anti-Christ. He quotes the authorities of Protestant commentators. I do not care for any man's authority—I have my own opinions, and, I think, they are as good as theirs; but I do not want to make any man take them as mine—they are founded on the word of God, and it is on that authority I hold them. I have prepared another picture for you to-day; it was this morning I

thought of it, and you will see how it represents the corruption of the Church of Rome in this world.

[Here Mr. Gregg unfurled a large sheet of paper, daubed over, as that shown on the first day had been, with dusky red and yellow; a stream of the former ran through the whole length of the paper, commencing from a small stripe of yellow at the top, and gradually widening to the bottom. Collateral with this ran a stream of the same colour, also commencing with yellow, which flowed out of the yellow at the head of the former, and this collateral stream towards the end abruptly changes into yellow, which afterwards is mingled with a narrow band of red issuing out of the great central stream of red, in the shape of a bent tube—the whole being not unlike the anatomical diagram of part of the arteries of a horse or *ass*. When this roll was exhibited, a cheer from the Rev. Mr. Nolan was the signal for a general shout of applause from the friends of Mr. Gregg, which was met by marks of disapprobation and cries of "silence" from those of the other party, and some confusion ensued.]

Rev. Mr. Macnamara—Gentlemen, a contract exists between the chair and the audience that silence should be observed during this discussion. I hope that neither party will break through that regulation. I must insist on silence being observed.

Mr. Gregg—I shall show it to you all; every one shall have ample opportunity of examining it. Here, you observe, is the primitive gold, and here is the corruption of the apostate Church of Rome. You see where the pure gold of primitive Christianity was communicated to Ireland, and where it ran on smoothly even long after the rest of the Church had been buried in corruption, until it also became corrupted, about the year 606, and became converted into that stream of red you perceive gradually becoming blacker and blacker, until it suddenly becomes changed into the primitive gold again, at the time that almost the whole of the bishops, the whole of the hierarchy and of the clergy, came over to us at the Reformation. All would then be well; but the head of the apostate Church, seeing one of his best garments torn from him, sends over his missionaries to recover what he had lost. Here they are, my friends; oh, here they are; that stream which flows in on the side from that which had been corrupted by the devil, and mingles its corruption with the pure gold of the true religion—that is modern Popery, my friends, corrupting the country like cockles, after it had emerged from that stream where our ancestors were drunk with corruption. My former picture I have called the stream of truth; this one I call the platform of truth. We are the reformed Catholic Church: we are the Church of Ireland. I want to make my friend see that I have reason on my side. You see, reverend Sir, that I have reason, and very strong reason; I have that which giveth force and truth to my reason---fellowship with God, through his Son, Jesus Christ. Now I want to show you that you ought to be indulgent to us, and not treat us so severely, as if we were not your brethren. I know that I might demonstrate the truth of my positions, and make them as clear as the noon day, and yet without the influence of God's Spirit it would profit nothing. I know, my dear Sir, that I cannot convert you, but I pray for your conversion with all my heart. You say that I have an interest in your prayers. Now, let me tell you that you have an interest not only in mine, but in the prayers of every Protestant in this country, who wish most anxiously for your con-

version. But to the arguments: I say that the miracles of the Church of Rome are false, deceptive, and absurd. Only think of a man carrying his head under his arms for twelve miles; I am not certain of the distance, but whether it be twelve miles or two miles, it makes no great difference; I can refer to it here in the Breviary. And only think of the child at the breast, the most pious and extraordinary child, which would not take suck more than once, I think it was, on Fridays and Wednesdays! Only think of that. What a young saint it was! And now I ask, could any one be stupid enough to believe such miracles? Miracles may be distinguished as of two sorts or classes, viz., miracles of power, or physical miracles, and miracles of Providence. The miracles of Christ were miracles of power---great supernatural works, which he wrought against the order of nature, to show his power to the nations which were to be converted to his faith. As to the miracles of Providence, we may take as an example the life of Joseph. Observe, my friends, how Joseph was saved when he was on the point of being destroyed by his brothers; observe how opportunely the Ishmaelites came up at that moment to be the cause of saving him; observe how he was afterwards saved from the machinations of his enemies in Egypt, and raised to great power, to be the means of saving his people at a future day. I ask you, is not all that as clear a miracle as those performed by Christ himself? Those are the miracles of Providence, and it is they in reality which convert the Christian. When any one witnesses the benignant and wise dispensations of Providence in his own family, do they not weigh as strongly with him as great and supernatural works, however extraordinary, could do? Are not all the miracles mentioned in the Old Testament, after the people had been established, and when physical miracles were necessary to be wrought, are they not all of that class? And does not the Sacred Scripture say "It is the Lord that healeth diseases?" to signify that we have the same reason to see the finger of God in the ordinary circumstances of life as if mountains were removed? And if we look at all those discoveries which have been made, and which tend to enlighten our minds and improve our nature; all those discoveries, I say, which have been made in Protestant England, and in Protestant America, her offspring---they are more convincing proofs of the hand of God than all the miracles the Church of Rome can boast of. I grant, indeed, that occasional discoveries have been made in Popish countries, but what are they to ours? When we see the velocity of wind outstripped---when we see the billows subdued---when we see light conveyed under ground until it bursts forth at the distance of miles---when we see mountains removed, and the high places made low---when we see all this, does it not do more to establish our faith than the reading of those monstrous miracles, the time for which is long since passed, and which would now be in contravention of the providence of God. When I behold all this, I exclaim, "Glory be to God on High, to God the Father, and God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, for ever and ever, amen!" Observe, my friends, that we preach the miracles of power also from our own pulpits; but we dwell much more on those miracles of Providence to which I have alluded. Now, a great deal of the miracles which the Romish Church boasts of are to be found only in Latin, for, when the books are translated into English, they are either modified or omitted. It is known that they would not go down with the common sense of the people of this country, and that they are too big to be swallowed by your credulity. In this Breviary we are told

in Latin how St. Denis carried his head under his arm ; and in the life of the same person, in a modern work of the Lives of the Saints, published by Mr. Coyne, of Capel-street, there is not one word of the miracle. Again, we are told in Dr. Middleton's "Rome," that it is believed in that city that the head of St. Paul, when cut off, gave three bounces---that three fountains sprung up at each spot it bounced on, and that those fountains are shown to the present day, and excite the deepest veneration in the people. Now, in Mr. Coyne's book there is not one word of all this in the Life of St. Paul; but it is simply stated that his head was cut off. Why are those miracles kept back, if it is not that if put before the people they would overcome their faith? If they shock us with their absurdity, if we find them contrary to the Spirit of God, that is the reason why they are not put forward. Mr. Maguire tells me to fear some visible visitation of Providence. So I was told in Sheffield by the Irish, when I went to preach there. An old woman said to me—"Ah! if the priest was here he would fasten you to the ground!" I don't expect to be fastened to the ground where I stand at present, though I challenge Mr. Maguire to exert his power on me ; I challenge him to fasten me to this spot. How well we hear of none of those miracles in Protestant England. To be sure there was something about one the other day, but it was hushed up, and it appeared that the less was said about it the better. But in Rome you have them every day ; they are as thick as hail there, and authenticated by affidavits, and the notary public, &c. Now, mark what the Apocalypse says: It tells us that the dragon had power to work miracles in the sight of the beast, hence that he had no power to do them out of the sight of the beast. Thus do we hear of miracles at Rome, but not in Protestant England. Then I don't call on you, Sir, to work a miracle, for that would be unfair ; but so much for miracles. I now come to another point : Mr. Maguire says that I object to the Book of Maccabees, because it recommends murder ; now, I do no such thing ; whatever brains I may have in my little head, I say that the spirit of a passage in that book is such that it bestows praise on an act of self-murder. I can't lay my finger on the passage immediately, but I shall quote it exactly for you as soon as I shall have found it. Mr. Gregg's half hour concluded.

Mr. Maguire.—I dare say, my friends, you will at once perceive it would be rather unkind of me to refuse rendering any satisfaction to Mr. Gregg which he may require. If I have been personal towards him, he has, I assure taken me on my weak side ; for there is not a man on earth, for whom I entertain a kinder feeling than him, and which has not once abated since the commencement of this discussion. If I have been betrayed into warmth, let it not be understood in a personal sense ; for I assure my friend that should he at any time visit me at Ballinamore, though theologically opposed, he should get the best potatoe I have, and the best sup in my house. But, gentlemen, is it not natural I should feel strong when the head of my church is described in such terms as a beast—a veiled prophet—when the glorious martyrs and learned doctors of antiquity are depicted in the colours which you have heard to day? Appeal to your own hearts whether, if you had been told your fathers and grandfathers, and great grandfathers, were living in damnable idolatry, and under the dominion of the beast with seven horns, you would not feel as I have felt? If I have then appeared warm, my heart is good ; for I must declare that during the arrangements for this discussion and since, I have always

found my friend a man of the most perfect honour and manly candour. I shall say nothing of the Book of Maccabees now, although I could adduce proofs from Scripture to demonstrate that it is canonical. He says only that the spirit of the text is against me; but I assert the context of it is in my favour. We are only quarrelling about the spirit. I do not pretend to posses it in a greater degree than ordinary mortals, nor would I quarrel with him about it but that I cannot compel him to admit that he is not inspired by the Holy Ghost. I shall however go on like the Arabs —not with my nose backwards—and though he has asked me to perform a miracle for him, I shall only say that I have not faith enough at this moment to do so. But does he imagine that because the church was left power to work miracles she can do so when she pleases? The Holy Ghost promised to be with his church in all ages; and whenever it is found necessary, or when he thinks proper to do so, he will perform miracles to attest her sanctity. The apostles got that power and possessed it, but does it follow that they could exercise that power when they pleased. Recollect they could not cast out devils, and that they were upbraided by our Saviour for their want of faith in not doing so. He has talked a good deal about the miracles of St. Denis. Are you, Sir, aware that we are not bound to believe one single miracle since the days of the Apostles, if we do not choose. I do believe they were performed, but I am not bound to do so, and am I not warranted in doing so, when I have the authority of the learned of antiquity, of St. Augustine and others? and does not Doctor Cave, a Protestant, relate, that St. Gregory Thaumurturges, one of the saints in your calendar, removed a mountain. How many miracles does St. Theoderet relate to have been performed? How many St. Augustine? Does he not tell us that over the shrine of one saint no less than seventy were performed, and one a raising from the dead. What answer would you give a Jew if he argued against you—he who resists that Christ taught miracles at all? Did not the Jews at first deny that he did so? When on earth and when they were forced to admit it, did they not ascribe them as being from the devil? And when judicial blindness came upon them, as it has on you (Mr. Gregg), did they not openly assert that they were performed by Beelzebub, the prince of darkness, in order to deceive mankind. You cannot deny that miracles have been performed in the holy Catholic church since the days of the Apostles. Your most eminent writers admit that it was so, and may I ask you, if a Jew said to you, "What a pretty miracle that was, of driving a legion of devils into a parcel of poor people's pigs, destroying and beggaring the widow and the orphan," what reply would you make to that? O, Sir, you are yourself furnishing the best argument to strike at the root of Christianity itself. It was foretold that Anti-Christ would come and reign on earth a time, and time, and a half time, that is three years and a half. Now I want to show your want of theology (a laugh); but that, however is not your fault, but Protestantism, for how can you know theology when she does not teach it? When Anti-Christ comes, we know that the Jews will be received into the fold of Jesus Christ, and they will again return to their country when real miracles will be performed. You talk of the use of miracles. Were not those of the Magicians in Egypt who turned the rod into a serpent, miracles? and if Moses had not turned his rod into a serpent, which devoured those of the Magicians', would not it have been acknowledged that the power of the former was from God? Thus, Sir, has God always stamped

the impress of his divinity upon his doctrines, and will again, when it is found necessary, perform miracles in his Holy and Apostolic Church. Sir I understand the doctrine of miracles as well as you, and the meaning of them as well as you, and it will be for those who hear you to believe what you say in contradistinction to all the learned and the pious of primitive times, and even the admissions of eminent men in modern days, professing your own opinions. You made a great display about prophecy—no doubt you did; but indeed I must say, I never met a man yet able to prove a thing with you, when it is proved before. It is not your own fault, as I have already said, but that of your Church. Now, I tell you what, you may humbug as you please about St. Denis—and, by the bye, why did you not mention that he pulled the devil by the nose? The friar had strong opinions on the subject of miracles, and believed them implicitly; and if you disbelieve them, I assure you, on my honour, that I believe them, though, as I have already said, I am not bound to do so. You say that miracles were not wrought since the time of the Apostles, and this you assert in the face of the whole Christian world; you say that they will not be wrought when Anti-Christ shall come, although it is expressly said that the time of his reigning shall be shortened, for fear of the elect, to three years and a half, as I shall show by Daniel, his favourite prophet. I think I have satisfied him about his favourite, St. Denis. He says he went to Coyne's for a Breviary, and he couldn't get one there, because it was not translated into English. If he have any wish that a translation of it should take place, I will assist him most readily. It is said of a certain Pope that he went to visit the Queen of Portugal---that he always rode the Queen's mare; after he was gone, however, whether the mare was conscious that the Sovereign Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ's Church on earth, had rode her, I know not, but certain it is that she would not allow the Queen to mount her any more. Now I tell you that, though it is against myself, but I must help you in some way. The Roman Catholic, Sir, has Christian principle, the Protestant has not. No Catholic is obliged to believe that a miracle was performed since the days of the Apostles; it is a matter of taste; but we believe they did take place. The mare, I suppose, learned new tricks for a bad rider; and thus, my Protestant friends, are our opinions, our doctrines, grossly misrepresented---I will not say intentionally---by my friend here; but it is generally so, by miserable and deluded men. I hope you entertain kind feelings towards me. There was not one unkind expression which I felt it my duty to use that I did not feel sorry for, and you will do me the justice to admit that I was dragged into it—that I was challenged and bearded, which was not the fault of Mr. Gregg, because he felt bound by his zeal to do so. "The zeal of thy house has eaten me up." If I then have used strong expressions, let it be taken into account the charges which my reverend friend has brought against my Church and her doctrines. He has told you that all liberty comes from Protestants. My dear Mr. Gregg, do you say this in earnest, or in perfect candour? It cannot be so. Did you ever hear of Thomas á Becket? Was he a Protestant? He called a convocation of Bishops to resist a Papist King, who was a Tory, and Catholics are sometimes rank Tories. The Church was then in connection with the State: she would be much better without it, in point of purity and holiness, as God himself has often shown, by inflicting persecutions upon her, and she wanted it badly on various occasions. If you tell me that Thomas á

Becket was a Protestant, though I believe you possess as much veracity as any other man, I'll never use a theological argument against you. Why so? Because all history, common sense, and all the monuments of England decide the contrary. This convocation arrayed the hostility of all the Bishops of England against King John; and let me ask you, Sir, who talk so much of liberty, did not Thomas á Becket die a martyr to liberty? Was he not murdered at the sacred altar of his God while attending vespers? So much, then, for Catholic liberty and *Magna Charta*. That was extorted from the tyrant, who shed the blood of him through whose instrumentality it was so extorted. England was then in communion with Rome, and what did this King do? He asked pardon for what he had done, and did public penance for the murder. Will you call him a Protestant King? Who ever heard of Protestantism being in those days? And yet, though the Church was invisible, as Mr. Gregg says, there was a Pope in Rome—and a Pope, too, who compelled the tyrant John to do penance for the foul murder he had committed. Go to Canterbury now, and there is the tomb of Thomas á Becket: his very blood is on the stone, it being impossible to efface it from that day to this. There is Popery, as adverse to liberty, for you. You, Sir, next talk of pictures. I accuse you of idolatry—you look at me as if you thought I was in earnest; yes, I am in earnest. You exhibited a picture here, showing the enormities of Popery, and the golden stream, and the stream of corruption, and all that. Now, did Roman Catholics ever pay half as much veneration to the images of the saints as you do to the statue of King William in College-green? I never yet paid half so much respect to a picture as you do to that. You think, perhaps, I am acting the part of a hypocrite. Look at all the Roman Catholics who are in this room; they know well what the doctrine of their Church and mine is, not like you and your Protestant brethren, always contradicting each other. Do you think I would be such an impostor as to assert before them what I knew they were well aware was not the fact? Would they not say that I was the greatest villain that ever lived? Would they not disclaim against the hypocrite Maguire, who told Mr. Gregg he does not adore those pictures, whereas in reality he does so? You honour and obey the statue of the Dutch Glencoe, and I call the eternal God to witness that I do not adore images or relics in the sense which you ascribe to them. Do you not, Mr. Gregg, worship your wife? Do you not vow to adore her with your body? Do you not love her as Christ loves his Church, and after the example of Saint Paul? Do you not honour the memory of your father and mother, or their portrait, if you have it in your possession, that your days may be long in the land? Yes, and we do the same as regards the Saints of God, who are gone before us; we honour their images, as calculated to inspire us with a resolution to follow their example in the practice of every holy virtue. Let me not then hear any more about images, and such stuff; and, having said so much, I will now proceed to what you have thought it convenient to pass over, namely, the apostacy of the Church of Rome. We'll first commence by reading a passage from Montague about this same apostacy, and also about the Pope being Anti-Christ; and as he is an eminent Divine of your Church, of course you'll believe what he says the more. The passage will be found in his Guide, pages 74 and 75. I am not of opinion that the Pope is Anti-Christ. The rev. gentleman then read a passage from Thorndyke, who was of opnion that those who separated

from the Church of Rome originally were either schismatics or idolators. There's for you—you may give me your own gloss if you wish—here is the opinion of one of the most eminent men of your Church. He also read an extract from Bishop Parker, another Protestant Divine, who pronounced such a charge against the Pope as that he was Anti-Christ, and the Roman Catholics idolators, a bloody indictment against the Christian world. Such a charge was too big for a scolding word. So uncharitable a calumny was worse than any act committed by the savage cannibals. Do you hear that (continued Mr. Maguire)? This Protestant Divine says, you damn your souls for accusing us of being idolators. What do you now think of Bishop Parker? He again says, "After all, we have nothing but crude assertions of popular Divines for such a conclusion." That is the popular Divine of Swift's-alley, who, in his hatred to Popes, never ceases pouring the foulest vituperation upon them, as well as upon every thing sacred. Now, what say you to the Pope being Anti-Christ? There's Bishop Parker's assertion, a Protestant Divine, like yourself, and one, give me leave to say—

The half hour ended, and

Mr. Gregg rose—Gentlemen, I have stated my views with regard to miracles, and my revereud opponent has argued as if I were against true miracles, and denied their validity. That is not so. I believe in them on totally different principles from him, and what induces me to do so makes me look upon the other species of miracles as diabolical. I will not say they may not have been wrought, but if such be the case, it was by the power of the Devil—for the Bible says they were false miracles, and wrought by Anti-Christ. I know miracles were wrought by the Apostles' Church, but that which my rev. opponent has called the Apostles' Church is, according to the Holy Scriptures, the Church of Anti-Christ. I believe in the miracles of Jesus Christ, because the Lord tells me so. I disbelieve the others, because I am told by the same authority to do so. Mr. Maguire is either criminally credulous, if he believe in the existence of such miracles, or he is guilty of profanation in calling them old wives' fables. But, Mr. Maguire, I tell you that won't answer. You must either admit they were true—and, so admitting, stand by them—or, should you not believe in them, you must disclaim them. Were these miracles supported by faith it would be a different matter; but, on the contrary, are they not supported by one of the most dreadful delusions ever perpetrated on mankind? Sir (turning to Mr. Maguire), you have stated an awful falsehood—namely, that gold rewarded a person for committing a venial sin. What is the whole object of the Bible but to condemn sin, in every shape? What brought death into the world? What is the cause of all the howlings and sufferings by which the damned are tormented, and will be so for all eternity? Would they not have committed venial sins if they expected a reward for them? My friends, lay aside this delusion attempted to be cast upon you—the assertion itself is not so tremendous in its consequences as the defamation and blasphemy of the holy name of God. What! rewarding men for committing venial sin! Now, my friends, let me refer to Rahab, but I must claim the privilege of my spectacles, as I am getting old. Mr. Maguire must excuse me, as he belongs to the corporation of bachelors. But, first, let me call your attention to one thing. My reverend opponent says Thomas à Becket was murdered by John—now, that is not the fact. Thomas à Becket was murdered by Henry the Second; that

shows you what it is to misquote even history; but no more about that at present, for I have now to judge of Popery, and its effects on mankind. Mr. Maguire talked yesterday of the midwives of Pharaoh, and said that St. Paul mentioned them as examples of the faith. Now, what is the fact? He did not mention them at all. I do not mean to disparage him for such an assertion—it is only part of the system, to uphold which he has lent himself, and which, I firmly assert, is the sole cause of the misfortunes of our country. I wish I could impress upon him to turn his mind to the whole Bible, and not be giving quotations—it may do in Ballinamore, but when he comes to the Rotunda he has caught a Tartar, I promise him (laughter). But to return to Rahab: I shall read for you what her faith was, from the Book of Joshua, 2d chapter—"And she said unto the men, I know that the Lord hath given you the land, and that your terror is fallen upon us, and all the inhabitants of the land faint because of you." That was the origin of their faith, and faith comes by hearing, and it not only comes from hearing, but from observation. I do tell you that one of the reasons Popery is now so much disordered is the fear of what is going to come upon her. I have observed of late those who profess her doctrines, trembling, trembling, trembling—I have seen men's hands tremble, particularly when I was in England, trembling before the Spirit of the Living God. There is a tremor abroad, I assure my friends, caused by a knowledge that Protestantism will yet be in the ascendant, for she has the Spirit of God. I ask you did not Rahab hide the spies? Well, that was a good act; she, however, violated the law, in telling that she had them not; yet, though she did so, it was only one of those acts which the just man commits who falls seven times a day. I am guilty of a fault to-day, but blessed be God, I am justified by faith and in the merits of Christ. She was justified likewise, yet she should have told the truth and not a falsehood, and in that respect she sinned; but our Blessed Saviour gave her deliverance through his blood. Is it not a dreadful, a deplorable thing, to hear a Christian Divine stand up here and assert that God rewards venial sin—that miracles are made a laughing-stock of. It is no matter, he says, whether he believes in miracles or not. I say it is his duty to believe in them when his faith is founded on them, as far as any other principle of his religion. I believe in the miracles of Christ—I glory in the possession of them, and depend on individual and a direct assurance from the Spirit. He tells me I am presumptuous in thinking so. Does he not give absolution in confession? and should not the person who receives it be fully assured that he is forgiven his sins, and say I am assured now that I am free from sin, and if I die I go to heaven? Again, he receives the Sacrament, which he holds in the body and blood of Christ. He receives then the holy Eucharist, and possesses within him, according to his belief, that God who redeemed him. Is he presumptuous, then, in thinking so? They may, indeed, entertain doubts; and no wonder that they get absolution. They may feel a vacuum in their souls after receiving the Sacrament, imagining there is something wanting; for no man who has not the support of Christ can be at rest. Man is made as the temple of God, and nothing can satisfy his immortal soul but the Deity itself; and when it wants the Deity it is like a fish out of water. They may try to console it with scraps of wood and nails, and scapulars, but all will not do. If any change be effected by these means it must be by a miracle indeed. If I have the Spirit why should I not prophecy? Do not

the Scriptures contain the spirit of prophecy, and is the testimony of Jesus? It is now that we look back, but formerly we used to look forward, for we see the evils which must necessarily come upon Popery. I object to miracles—I object to that doctrine which teaches that venial sins are rewarded by God. I say again, my not believing in pretended miracles does not invalidate those wrought by Christ. Look at this book, and when I read some passages of it for you, it will at once be shown you that idolatry reigns in the Church of Rome. (The reverend gentleman here read a prayer from the Litany of the Sacred Heart of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and continued.)—I say that is idolatry—rank, downright idolatry, no matter what species of idolatry, no matter what species of sophistry may be used in explanation. Suppose I go into a room where I saw one man cutting the throat of another, what would you think if he said I am not murdering him? I would say, how can you convince me of that against the evidence of my senses? And I tell the reverend gentleman that this is the perfection of idolatry, and that it is fallacy to deny it. Who can doubt but such conduct must provoke the jealousy of the Most High God? Let us not be going to the idol in College Green, or to that of George the Second, which is in Stephen's Green. Oh, dear! oh, dear! Mark the effects of this apostacy on a great portion of mankind.

The half-hour here ceased.

The Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—You perceive, after all, the tact of this spiritualized man who is opposed to me. What has he done in order to blink the main question at issue, namely, whether the Pope of Rome is Anti-Christ? He talked of various things, and introduced various subjects, all of which I shall dispose of in a very short time, I promise him. He accuses us of idolatry—we deny it; he has adduced no proofs of it. Ours is, that we respect the images of those blessed saints who have gone before us—that they only serve to remind us of their virtues—that, at all events, if we be guilty of idolatry, we are not aware of it, consequently it is not idolatry, for there can be none without a free will, and nothing can burn without that. If I, Sir, had attacked you for being idolatrous, and that you, before your God, denied it, I would believe you. I have given you proofs that we are not—proofs you will not have. You will not listen to the authority of those who have been eminent in your church. No matter what I say to you, it is impossible for me to keep you to the position which you are bound to support. I never said that you did not believe in the miracles performed by Jesus Christ. I showed you the acts of the magician, as related in the Old Testament, where he performed false miracles; but that the stamp of the Divinity was upon those wrought by Moses, and that God, when it was necessary, would perform miracles for the benefit of his church. There is reason and philosophy in that, neither of which you know much about. You say you admit those miracles that are approved of and acknowledged by your church. There again you are at nought, for you have no church—you cannot prove the Divinity of the Scriptures, for you have no authority but a fallible one to appeal to, and therefore you have neither Scriptures nor Church. I put the question to you repeatedly; you have not answered it—you cannot do so; and I ask you is it honesty still to abide by it. Your conduct will be recorded in Heaven and before man, for the manner in which you have acted. You ask me, again, about miracles performed since the days of the Apostles, to which I answer, my church allows me

to exercise my own judgment. I believe those miracles were wrought from time to time by holy saints. Do you prove they were not; for, I assure you, vulgar abuse and vituperation will not supply the place of argument. I have shown you have no principle—that you must look for guidance to a mere fallible authority. You have not said one word on the subject, because you could not, and I do not blame you for it, but your church. You then quoted St. Paul about Rahab, to convict me of misquoting. Here is the text. We will see if that be as true as everything else you said. "By faith Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace." I also quoted St. James, 2d chapter, 25th verse—"Likewise also was not Rahab the harlot justified by works when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way?" Now, Mr. Gregg, you were ignorant of philosophy and theology when you say she ought to have told the truth, and deliver the spies up, by order of her King. She believed another King, who gave them their lives, had a better right to them than he had, and therefore she was taught by faith not to give them up. And, Mr. Gregg, learn of two evils to choose the least. If these were equal, God would not have rewarded her for the part she acted. Did I not argue yesterday that she was only guilty of a venial sin, and not that God rewards those who commit venial sins. I did not boast of my sanctity, nor destroy the meaning of the testimony of Jesus Christ. I did not boast of the Spirit, or of possessing superior holiness; "for in many things we all offend." Do you mean to say, or will you assert, that both the sins which she had at her option to commit were mortal sins? If so, my Doctor, why did God reward her for committing a mortal sin? The Apostles were inspired who commended her for what she had done, and, according to you, she was guilty of mortal sin—for you'll have no venial sins to exist; and, therefore, God did in this instance that which is contrary to his justice. Oh! it is Protestantism without principle, for you cannot get out of the dilemma. Had she produced the spies, she would have been guilty of murder. By not doing so she violated the laws of her King and country; and, therefore, according to you, she was guilty of mortal sin in either case, and God rewarded her for so doing. Let your theology get you out of that, dear Mr. Gregg. You thought you did a great deal when you found me commit an historical error. I appeal to the auditory if I did not mention with great diffidence the name of John as the King of England when Thomas a Becket was murdered. You see that shews clearly that I belong to an infallible church, for when I got into history I became fallible. The Spirit of God is with me when I advocate the truths of his church, but the moment I get into history I am vulnerable. invincible in theology and the cause of truth, the moment I quit those I fall into a mistake. *Ecclesia invicta recest.* But what has the name of a King to do with the matter; did not the thing occur. Was he not murdered? And I ask you again, was he a Catholic or a Protestant? Get out of that if you can. Where was your church then? I'll give you time to answer that, Mr. Gregg. You talk of the simplicity and innocence of your church. What made you put Bishop Fisher to death? Because he denied the supremacy of Henry 8th, in matters of faith. You have heard of, and of course thoroughly believe, all that is contained in Fox's lying Book of Martyrs. What a pretty specimen of truth that is. Did you ever read Doctor Martin Luther's letter against the accursed King of England, *Contra Maledicti Regem Angli*? Whether

is a man or a woman the proper head of the church? Will you answer me that, Mr. Gregg? I know that Christ asked St. Peter, "Lovest thou me?—feed my lambs, feed my sheep;" but I never heard, and I'd be exceedingly glad if you'd show me at what time, and in what place, the same power was vested in George the Fourth, who knew so many Duchesses and Countesses under a tester. Talk of the blood of the saints, as mentioned in the Revelations, what does it mean but those cruel persecutions inflicted by the infernal Pagan empire, which for four hundred years shed the blood of the holy martyrs, inflicting on them the most cruel punishments which they could devise? You wanted to avoid my demonstration of that text, but I have the Spirit of Truth. I belong to the Church of God, and cannot be led astray. You have rambled from one thing to another; you have said that you would prove we are guilty of apostacy. Have you said one word about it? Is not that begging the question? If you prove apostacy in the first place, all the other abominations which you protest so loudly against will of course follow in the train. But you do not go on principle—you dare not attempt to prove that proposition. It will be now my business to prove beyond the possibility of a doubt, and I beg of those who have a heart or a soul to save, to offer up their prayers to the Eternal God, whether Protestant or Presbyterian, while you hear me demonstrate that the Pope is not Anti-Christ. I beg of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, to listen attentively to what I shall say; and, if my answer be not conclusive—if it be not satisfactory, then I will give up all I have said since the commencement of the discussion. St. Paul calls Anti-Christ the man of sin, and surely that cannot be applicable to the succession of Popes for 1800 years. Again, you will find the expression of Scripture is, "and the number of him is 666." If it referred to Popes, it ought to be them. Again, "if another shall come in his own name, him will ye receive." The Jews have not received the Pope as yet, consequently Anti-Christ is not come; and will any man here, after this, tell me that the Pope is Anti-Christ? There's a clincher for you, Mr. Gregg. I shall next refer you to Saint Mark, xiii., 24. "But in those days, after that tribulation, the earth shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light." The sun is not yet darkened, unless, indeed, by an occasional eclipse, and, therefore, Anti-Christ is not yet come. Again, I'll refer Mr. Gregg to his favourite Daniel, vii. 25. "And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws, and they shall be given into his hand until a time, and times, and the dividing of time." Again, in Apocalypse, xiii., 14, "And he doth great, great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from Heaven in the sight of men, and deceive them that dwell on the earth, by means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast, saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they shall make an image to the beast which had the wound by a sword and did live." Give me leave to ask, and I beg to call your attention to the next from Daniel, xii., 11—"And from the time that the daily Sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days." Mr. Gregg makes it 1290 years; strange perversion! instead of 1290 days, or three years and a half, which accounts for Christ saying he would shorten the time for the sake of the elect; but, according to Mr. Gregg's interpretations, there would not be much abridgment in making it 1290 years. In Revelations, xi., 3, "and I will give power

unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophecy a thousand two hundred and three score days clothed in sackcloth." Are they not called forty-two months, which make it exactly three years and a half according to the old Julian calculation?" The matter is made more clear from the following passage from Mat. xxiv.,22—"And except those days should be shortened, there should be no flesh saved; but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." Compare those passages of the Holy Scripture, and you will see that this thing about the Pope being Anti-Christ, is a farce which no one dreams of asserting unless fanatics, for the worst of purposes? Those servants of God have not as yet appeared, therefore Anti-Christ is not come. They will have power to work miracles in order to counteract the power which will be given to Anti-Christ; and in order that the Jews may not be deceived, Elias will preach in Jerusalem, and Enoch over every portion of the globe. The beasts shall kill them in the streets of Jerusalem, where they shall lie for three days in the public streets. Did they appear as yet? O, no, no; and yet this doctrine is put forward that the Vicar of Christ's church on earth is Anti-Christ. "Oh! Israel, perdition is thy lot." It is said he will have a sign. Is it the sign of the Cross of Jesus Christ that shall be that sacred sign which, as Tertullian said, was used by the Christians in his time? "Eating and drinking, lying down and getting up," made by repeating the Holy Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The Pope styles himself the servant of the servants of God, vicar of Christ's church on earth. There is not much of the beast about that—and yet, forsooth, he is Anti-Christ. I have by me no less than seventeen Holy Fathers to prove that he is the successor of Saint Peter, and vicar of Christ; but I shall lay them aside, and give you some of your Protestant authors.‖ Melancthon, in his epistle to Saint Leo, professes a wish to abide by the authority of the Holy See; but the moment he is excommunicated by that Pontiff, then he wishes to renounce what he had said, that the Bishop of Rome was above all other churches, and joined Luther in his opposition. The celebrated Bacon coincided with the opinion of the ancient Fathers, that the successor of Saint Peter was the Pope of Rome. We have also Leibnetz; and the Calvinists declared, in 1795, that the chair of succession was so affixed to the ring, that if Saint Peter and Saint Paul, and the primitive Christians, came on earth again, they would find no other Religion but that of the Church of Rome pure and undefiled. The reverend gentleman was about quoting Thorndyke when the half hour ceased.

The Rev. Mr. Gregg trusted that the God of Grace would give strength to know the truth, without any dependance on human authority. He flung away Eusebius, and St. Augustine, and those Protestants quoted by Mr. Maguire—he looked only to the church—and the word of God said, "Cursed is he who placeth his trust on man." In order to obtain real knowledge one must be as simple as a little child; and he would then proceed to answer what the Rev. Mr. Maguire had advanced. The reverend gentleman then proceeded at some length to try if the texts were quoted by Mr. Maguire correctly from the original Greek; and the only difference between them was, that Mr. Maguire read the original "the man of sin," whereas Mr. Gregg thought it should have been read "that man of sin." He then read extracts from a Greek fable, in a work written by the Rev. Mr. Fisher, and styled "The Beast and his Image," to prove that the number 666 in the Revelations applied to the

Pope of Rome. After which he exhibited satans, scapulars, candles, girdles, beads, holy-water pots, which he scattered about in wild profusion, while the reverend gentleman himself seemed ready to play a scene over again which had been the cause of so much edification (!) on a former day.

It being three o'clock, it was adjourned to the morning.

FIFTH DAY.

SATURDAY, June 2nd, 1838.

This being the day set apart for the handling of some questions which are of such a nature that it was necessary to exclude females from the discussion of them, the Round Room of the Rotunda was filled exclusively by men, and it was not till a much later hour than usual that there was any appearance that the crowd would be very great. The numbers, however, increased exceedingly about twelve o'clock; and, notwithstanding the great exertions of the police, who were under the command of Mr. Murphy, inspector of the C division, considerable confusion sometimes occurred at the entrance, arising from the rush of persons going in contrary directions. A much stronger disposition to exhibit party feelings was evinced this day than on any former ones, and the interference of the chair was frequently called for. Mr. Maguire, and his chairman, were on the platform, as usual, about twenty minutes before the hour; and, in about a quarter of an hour after, Mr. Gregg ascended the platform, arrayed in the robes of a Minister of the Church of England. When eleven o'clock arrived,

Mr. MAGUIRE rose and said—I call on Mr. Gregg to go on with this day's proceedings.

Mr. GREGG—There is one preliminary question which I would wish to put to the Rev. Mr. Maguire. I propose that we should resume this discussion on Tuesday, and not on Monday, in order that we might have time for repose. Is it the wish of my reverend friend that such should be the arrangement?

Mr. MAGUIRE was understood to say that in his opinion a day should not be lost, and that they should go on until the discussion was concluded.

MR. GREGG—Then, I am at your disposal. My friends, I appear this day in my canonicals—in the canonicals of a minister of the Church of England, in order that I might justify to you and to the world the course which I adopted yesterday in bringing forward some of the garments, and other articles belonging to the Church of Rome. I must say, in the first place, that it is not true, as was said of me, that it was relics which I then produced. It was a cord of St. Francis, and a scapular, and a stole, and blessed candles, and other things which had been consecrated by the Church of Rome, which I brought here; and I have condemned them, because they are supposed by those who receive them, to contain a peculiar character—to have a power conferred upon them by the process of consecration. I don't blame canonicals—we have them in the true Catholic church—we use them in our pulpits—and one reason might

be sufficient to authorize that practice, viz., that the dress of the minister in the pulpit should not be liable to be changed every day, according as different fashions are introduced, but that it should always present the same appearance; but we do not use any of the absurd and ridiculous ceremonies of consecration in preparing them for use; they do not come to us from the hands of the bishop, as if receiving some peculiar perfection from his benediction; we have not the long ceremonial about them which we find in the Popish ritual. Therefore, I say, that there is nothing in the canonicals of our church towards which an infidel could act with justice in the same manner in which I acted yesterday towards the balderdash of the Popish church. It is for decency that we use our canonical dress, as I said before, to avoid the changes of fashion; and it may often happen that a poor clergyman, who has not got a good coat to wear in public, may be very happy to cover it with those robes in the pulpit. I have our surplice here, too—behold it (holding it up to the audience), and it is a very significant part of our ministerial dress. You see it is white, and observe the words of the Scripture, that those are they who are clothed in white robes, and who shall go before the Lamb. We do not proclaim in our almanacks who are privileged to make those articles. Here you have, in the Romish Directory, the names of goldsmiths who are empowered by a special favour to touch the sacred vessels, which no other layman dare lay his hand on. Now, I say, that all those things are at variance with the spirit of true religion, and with the simplicity of the Word of God, and that they are absurd and ludicrous in the highest degree. I will now say a word on a *lapsus linguæ*, into which I am ready to acknowledge that I fell yesterday, with regard to an argument which he urged against me from the words of the Scripture —"That man of sin." I said *the* man of sin, and he took up the Protestant Bible against me to show me that I was wrong. Now, I refer him to the original Greek, and although the word there employed is rendered *that*, yet it is quite plain that that particle has no force at all, and that it merely signifies *the* man, &c. When he fell into a lapse in history, he told you that it was because he belonged to an infallible church, and that he thus was mistaken, because he travelled off his ground, which was divinity. Now, I must say, that it is rather an extraordinary consequence of the infallibility of his church, that he should be liable to fall into such mistakes—very extraordinary, indeed. Now, I don't say that our church is infallible; neither do I say that it is fallible, as he says I do. I don't understand the meaning of that word, infallible, because I do not find it in the Bible. There is no such word in the Holy Scripture, and I say give me the Word of God. I don't bind up my hands—I don't surrender my reason, but I rely on the church, and defer to her, because she is the pillar and the ground of truth. On it I stand, and to it I defer: but I look to the Word of God, which is paramount to the authority of the church, and to all things.—So much for his tripping in history; but what if I find the rev. gentleman tripping in divinity, too? Now, I will point out two most flagrant mistakes which he has committed in the sacred Scripture. He said, that 144,000 men were faithful in the time of the prophet Elijah, and those alone of the tribe of Benjamin. Now, what if it was in the reign of Rehoboam, and not at all in the time of Elijah, that those 144,000 men are mentioned to have existed? Yet such is the case; and is not this a mark not that his church is infallible, but that it is an ignorant, false, and

blundering church; while the church to which I defer, is the standard of truth and of pure religion? Again, he said that the city on the seven hills is Constantinople. Now, mark, my dear friends, I pray you mark his respect to his own church. Here is the Douay Bible, to which is attached the names of all his bishops in this country—at least if any of them are absent, it does not signify much. Here you have Doctor Murray at the head of them. Well, in this Douay Bible it says, in an annotation to the passage in the Apocalypse which speaks of Babylon, "either Babylon means the city of the devil, in general, or, if it means any particular city, it is to be referred to pagan Rome, rather than to any other city which we know of." Thus, you perceive, he sets at open defiance the authority of the Douay Bible, when he says that Babylon means Constantinople. Oh, see what it is to belong to a false and blundering church! We have in Daniel, chapter vii., verse 17, &c., a description of the four great kingdoms—that is of the Babylonian, the Persian, the Greek, and the Roman: "These great beasts, which are four, are four kings which shall arise out of the earth. * * * * * Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast, which was diverse from all the rest, exceedingly dreadful, whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass—which devoured, brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet; and of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell; even of that horn which had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things—whose look was more stout than his fellows." And farther on, "Thus he said, the fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon the earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down and break it in pieces. And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise. And another shall arise after them, and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and shall think to change times and laws," &c. Is not all this plainly to be referred to Rome, not pagan Rome, but Papal Rome, which is pagan Rome revived? and has it any reference whatever to Constantinople, whose empire never overran the earth, and which was never sufficiently great to be referred to in those words of the prophet? Before I come to the particular business of the day, I will again take up the subject of venial and mortal sins, which have reference to it, and I deny that any such distinction is to be found in the Scripture. The first passage brought forward by my rev. friend, and he used many of them, was from St. Matthew, chapter v, verse 22—"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill, shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother, without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say unto his brother, *Raca*, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." Now, I show from these texts, the very contrary to what is asserted by the Rev. Mr. Maguire—I show from them that there is no distinction between mortal and venial sin. Here, in the first place, Christ puts the man who kills, and the man who is angry with his brother without cause, on an equal footing, he shall be in danger of the judgment, that is, of damnation; again, "he that shall call his brother, *Raca*, shall be in danger of the council," that is, of the Sanhedrim—he shall be in danger of being brought before a temporal tribunal for the

enormity of the crime, therefore he shall be in danger of hell fire. Now, the word *Raca*, is Syriac, which is connected with the Chaldean; and in that language it signifies *Molice*, that is, an effeminate person.—Before I proceed any further, I would propose that as females have been excluded from this discussion, so every young person now present should leave the meeting. Does that meet your approbation, Rev. Sir.

Mr. Maguire—Why, Mr. Gregg, I don't intend to bring forward any blackguardism at all in the discussion. I trust that no language used by me, shall be such that it might not be heard by the young as well as the old; but you know what you intend to say, and can best tell what is to be done.

Mr. Gregg—I bring nothing forward but your own words. It is your own divinity which I use. I repeat my question.

Mr. Maguire—I consent to any thing you may think fit in the matter.

A voice in the remotest part of the room exclaimed, with a loud scream, "Don't be taking up Mr. Gregg's time." (Loud cries of "turn him out—turn him out," and great confusion, to put an end to which the police had to interfere.)

Mr. Gregg—I say that their neighbours should send out any young persons who are near them. Young gentlemen, I say, go out. You had no business to come here at all; and your parents behaved very wrong to send you here. The word Raca, then, means a Sodomite—one who abuses himself; and whoever shall call his brother by that name, the crime shall be so enormous, that he shall be brought before the Sanhedrim or Council—that is, before a temporal tribunal. Finally, whoever shall call his brother fool, shall be in danger of hell-fire. But the whole context of the Bible goes to prove that there is no distinction of sin, and that every sin is mortal. It is vain to appeal to common sense on this point. The common sense of mankind can be no judge of the nature and distinctions of sin; that is not a proper subject for its decision, though it may do well enough to determine that a man is not a house-clock. You must show from the Divine Word that there is a distinction of sin; and can you show from that that any breach of the law of God, any insult against his holy will and word, does not merit the wrath of Jehovah and the punishment of hell? Now we come to Peter Dens. But how comes it, young persons, that you have not gone out? Leave this meeting, I tell you—leave it. Well, then, I call on Mr. Maguire to read his own book. Mr. Maguire, will you read this book?

Mr. Maguire—I have nothing to do with your extracts.

Mr. Gregg—Well then, if I am obliged to read this divinity, and that any evil do result from it, on the heads of those who wrote it be the sin! I read it for the good of the country, and for the good of your souls. I read it that those of my Roman Catholic brethren who hear me may understand what kind of intercourse is kept up between their wives and the priests—on what terms they stand with each other, and what is the subject of communication between them. [Here Mr. Gregg read a translation of some passages in Dens' Theology, intended as instructions to a priest in the confessional, to know the state of the conscience of married persons, and persons who find a repugnance to confess their sins.] Here we have the means which a priest should employ to investigate all those sins, and to pump your wives and daughters; they are directed to be very cautious; and here we have the opinion of St. Anthony quoted on the subject. What a subject for the meditations of a saint! What a

subject for the communication of a priest with females—and of a bachelor priest too, who is liable himself to burn sufficiently and constantly, without the provocation of such communication! Instead of this, should he not content himself with simply pointing out the putting away of all the body of sin, without entering into the odious particulars? But it is not from this book alone that I could quote on this subject; here they are in bundles.

Mr. Gregg's half hour ended.

Mr. Maguire—Gentlemen, it is right that I should inform you that my reverend friend has travelled back in his last speech to subjects which had been most amply handled three days back, and which we might have considered as decisively discussed. But it is because he has a reinforcement of argument, for which he is indebted to some friendly lucubrations, he thinks fit to return to them; and he is at perfect liberty, for all that I care, to do so. He returns to the "I, even I" of the prophet Isaiah, and accuses me of a gross mistake in quoting the passage of Scripture. He said that the 144,000 were only fighting men. I answered that they were of the tribe of Benjamin, that they belonged to the true Church of God in the old law: no matter whether they belonged to the kingdom of Judea or the kingdom of Israel, for both were of the Jewish Church; they were 144,000 men of one tribe alone; how, then, I repeat, could the Jewish Church have been invisible at their time? But the Jewish Church was the type of the new Church of Jesus Christ. If the former was not invisible, neither could the latter be. So much for your scriptural knowledge, reverend sir. In your last half hour yesterday you committed a gross error, and one unworthy of fair discussion. In speaking of venial sin, you said that I wanted to make it appear that God rewarded venial sin because he rewarded Rahab. I said no such thing, Mr. Gregg; but I wanted to make it appear that Rahab did not lose the grace of God, because he rewarded her, although she committed venial sin. But according to you, Sir, God rewarded her for mortal sin; because you hold that the sin she committed was mortal. Hence it stands thus—I maintain that venial sin does not kill the soul, which mortal sin does, as its name signifies. And you say that God rewards mortal and venial sin, while I maintain that he rewards neither. Let us now come to the parable of the unjust steward, and I say that if you explain that for me, I will explain the circumstance of Rahab for you. I again refer you to the Epistle of St. John, where it is said that there is a sin unto death and a sin which is not unto death; and I say that this either proves the distinction between mortal and venial sin, or else it proves the doctrine of prayers for the dead. St. John says that there is a sin unto death; now, if I understand that rightly, it signifies a sin in which a man perseveres without repenting to death; and that the sin which is not unto death is that in which a man does not die impenitent. You know, Sir, it is unquestionably lawful to pray for a man while living, no matter how great his sin may be. In the same way, is it proper to pray for him who shows no signs of repentance at death, that is in the case of sin unto death, if it be right to pray for a man while in the state of sin? Now, Sir, allow me to ask you how you will get over the midwives of Egypt? Why did God reward them, if they were guilty of mortal sin? The King of Egypt issued an order commanding them to put to death all the male children of the Israelites as soon as they should be born. They did not, however, comply with his commands, and they told him

that the women of Israel took care to be delivered before they sent for them. Thus they told a lie to the King; but the Scripture says that "because they feared God he built unto them dwellings." But if they had committed a mortal sin—an act which placed them in a state of damnation—why should God have rewarded them by building dwellings for them? My friends, Mr. Gregg has told you a great deal about the word *Raca*, a great deal also which was very edifying, and he expended a vast deal of learning in it. What a waste of learning that was! I proved that he was wrong in his quotation about "the man of sin," and he, endeavouring to show that he was right, had recourse to the original Greek, and told you a great deal about the force of particles. What are the poor ignorant Protestants to do who do not know Greek as my reverend friend does? If they cannot make an act of faith without having recourse to the Greek original, I ask you what are they to do? The Scripture most distinctly points out shree sorts of sin, namely, that which is subject to the judgment, that which is subject to the council, and, finally, the third, which is alone condemned to hell. The first is that slight feeling which may break out between brothers or friends—that difference which may exist between children, and which does not destroy charity. If it were not venial, how should it be distinguished from that highest outbreak, which is designated in the Scripture by calling a brother "thou fool?" In the first case there is not, as it were, any overt act of passion; in the latter is denoted the highest pitch of anger. I quoted the Apostle James, where he says, "In many things we all offend." Therefore the apostles offended in many things. But will Mr. Gregg say that the apostles were in the habit of committing mortal sin, and that they were very often in the state of damnation? If so, how should they be inspired? Every hour and moment of our lives we do commit those small offences to which St. James alludes; and are we every hour and moment of our lives in the state of damnation? And were the apostles, according to the words of St. James, constantly committing mortal sins? What a beautiful specimen of pure Protestant doctrine, that those who may be called the second founders of Christianity—those to whom Jesus Christ with his own mouth gave the commission to establish his church—should have been every moment of their lives in the state of damnation! But what need we wonder; the Protestant Church has no principles. My reverend friend says that it is infallible, and again, that it is fallible. What beautiful divinity is in that hesitation—that difficulty to decide whether she is fallible or infallible! You see, my friends, that he does not wish to lay aside the superiority which he claims for his church of being judge in matters of faith. His church is too fond of high Tory principles, and he knows well that he dare not give that privilege up, with all his liberty of private judgment. What a church, and what a fine theology he has! He says he does not understand the word infallible, because he can't find it in the Scriptures. Now, I ask him, does he find the word procession in the Scripture, or the word trinity in the Scripture, or the word consubstantiality in the Scripture? And yet, all those doctrines, the names of which are not to be found in the Scripture, are matters of faith in his church. What a church it is which teaches that the whole of Christendom was in a state of damnation for more than 800 years! Now, his saying that his church is fallible and infallible reminds me of a man who would not drink whiskey in a public-house, nor outside a public-house, but who would drink it on the threshold. If

he takes it outside he is afraid of the church, and if he goes inside he is afraid of me—so he prefers the little horn of the dilemma. He tells you very triumphantly that I contradict myself, and he quotes me against my own Bible. Was it not Dr. Heyland, in his Cosmography, whom I quoted, and not any opinion of my own which I brought forward? I quoted Dr. Heyland's Cosmography, and other Protestant commentators, to show that, in their opinion, it was not Pagan Rome which was referred to in the Apocalypse. I quoted them to show that Constantinople was a city built on seven hills; that on one of them was the great Mosque of St. Sophia, and the Turkish Seraglio; that it was the *Nova Roma*, and was as likely to be the Babylon of the prophecy as Christian Rome. You said, Rev. Sir, that you held both public and private judgment to be the rule of faith. Now, I ask you, is the Holy Ghost the author of both? And if they should come in collision—if they should differ with each other, as they have often done, and must, in the nature of things, be liable to do, how can you bring the Holy Ghost out of the difficulty? You talk, Sir, with an infidel sneer, of Rome having converted nations from Paganism. O, Sir, I ask you to look back to the streams of blood which flowed from the holy martyrs who carried Christianity into distant lands, and fixed the standard of the Cross triumphant over the ruins of Paganism? Believe me that infidelity will triumph at this contest between Christianity and Christianity—for I don't deny that you have Christianity—I don't deny that you retain much of what you borrowed of the faith of Jesus Christ from us, still in common with us. I will not dwell at any length on what you have said of morose delectation, for it is not a subject which I would introduce before any audience; but it appeared to me that you derived the word *morose* from *moralis*, whereas it comes from the word *moror*, a delay, that is, a dwelling on a sinful thought. But, my friends, according to the principles of my reverend opponent, there is no sin in such delay. You may dwell as long as you like on a sinful thought, for there is nothing in Protestant morality to prevent you, and you will not be advised to the contrary. You may do what you please, provided it be not done openly and before the world. Now, I say, if all that ever was written by Peter Dens on the various distinctions of certain sins, and all that was ever written on the same subject by other compilers of moral theology—and observe, that which was never intended for any but those who sit as judges in the tribunal of confession—that which was intended to guide the priest in the direction of souls, has been collected into a volume, and translated into English, and I have known it to be received through the post by ladies in remote parts of the kingdom—it has been brought within the reach of every wife and of every daughter in the British empire. I say, if all that were as infamous, and as disgusting, and as villainous, and as abominable, as my rev. friend, with his false and corrupt English translation, could wish to make it, what is all that to me? I differ with Peter Dens in many things, and what of that? He holds that the Pope is above the councils; I say the contrary. He says that the Pope, *ex cathedra docens*, is infallible. This he holds with the Italian divines; while the theologians of France, and of other countries, who, being on this side of Italy, are called by them *ultra-montanists*, and with whom I agree, do not agree to that opinion; and the church has always left the question open to us for free discussion. I have nothing to do with any peculiar opinions of Peter Dens; but let us come to the

point. I argue thus:—Suppose that Jesus Christ did, in reality, as we Roman Catholics say, and as I am prepared to prove, establish the sacrament of penance—that he did institute the tribunal of confession, as a medium to apply the merits of his sacred blood to our souls, and as a glorious and most beneficent means of restoring us to the purity which we lose by actual sin—suppose he did institute that holy tribunal, are not the necessary consequences which flow from it the work of Christ as much as the sacrament itself? Are they not the work of Jesus Christ, and not of Peter Dens, or any Divine of the Roman Catholic church? Suppose, then, I prove that Christ did establish confession, of what use would it be, if the ministers to whom he had given the power of absolution, were unacquainted with the nature of the crimes from which they were to absolve—if they knew not those secret thoughts and acts which defile the soul before God, and which, to be forgiven, the ordinance of Christ requires should be confessed—if they were not instructed how to advise the penitent, that he may escape those dangerous precipices? And what has Peter Dens done but give such assistance to the minister of religion as might guide him in that arduous and unpleasant duty? He did not intend it to be handed about among the people in their native tongue, and divested of the cloak which a dead language and the austerity of religion cast over it, but which those who think with my rev. friend have torn off, that they might place it in the hands of every girl and of every innocent boy that speaks the English language. He did not intend it to be made the subject of public discussion before such an audience as that which is now before me. Now, my friends, I will give you the fullest opportunity of seeing this question in its true light. I undertake to prove the sacred origin of confession, first, from the sacred Scriptures; secondly, from the practice of the ancient church; thirdly, from the wisdom, and beauty, and mercy of such an institution, which immediately stamp it with the character of its divine origin; and, fourthly, from the admission of its utility and necessity, made by the most eminent Protestant divines. I shall first then show whether the principle of confession be itself divine; and, in the second place, whether its practice and the results which flow from it be not justifiable—thus putting it to you in the most tangible point of view possible. First, then, as to the principle: that sacred institution was left, as the holy Fathers were accustomed to call it, the second plank after shipwreck. But as the time which now remains to me is too short to enter into the demonstration, I shall occupy the few minutes I have with an observation on the other side of the question. Suppose for a moment that Jesus Christ did not establish confession, what invention more damnable or abominable—what more abhorrent to human nature was ever devised by man or demon? And how could so anti-human, so diabolical an institution become established in all Christian Europe—in Greece, in Italy, in France, in Spain, in Portugal, in Germany, in the kingdoms of the North, in England, in Scotland, and in Ireland? What! was the whole civilized world so debased as to receive that abominable and disgusting invention of depraved man, and that without any history that reached us mentioning one word of the time of the revolting innovation? History tells us of other heresies, when they appeared and when they disappeared; but this one, the foulest, the most diabolical of all the heresies that were ever broached, or that ever issued from the bottomless pit, not one word of even the age or the whereabouts it first made its appearance!

The half hour terminated here.

Mr. Gregg—How should it have been enforced all over the world? inquires Mr. Maguire. Why, does he not recollect that it is said of Anti-Christ that he shall brand men with his mark all over the world? How should it be done unless the devil brought it about? and I shall prove as clear as the noon day that the devil is the author of confession. Mr. Maguire is very angry with me. So is the seducer very angry with him who discovers him; so is the man who debauches another man's wife very angry with the husband when he finds him out, and with the newspapers, and the lawyers, for exposing him. Oh! he says, why should they bring my nice things before the world? why should I not be allowed to indulge in my happiness *sub rosa*, unseen by mankind. It is thus that Mr. Maguire asks, why were all the delicious things we enjoyed in our studies of Divinity brought before the world? I answer, because the last days of Babylon are nigh—because the time for bringing its abomination to merited infamy is, by the will of God, arrived—and, filthy and detestable as it is, I shall proclaim it from the house-top—I shall denounce it to the whole world. Perhaps the publisher of this work (Extracts from Dens) had, without being aware of it, a Divine commission, which made him an instrument in the hands of Providence to a most meritorious work. He conferred a great benefit on society. The translator has also undoubtedly, by Divine Providence, conferred another great benefit on society; for Popery demoralizes the world, and he has torn from it the veil which covered it. We now see it as it really is—it is no longer concealed from us by a mask, and we disclose it in all its hideous deformity to the world. When men first burst the bonds of Popery, nature ran riot—but the spirit of Protestantism soon curbed and purified it. Thus, in the same manner, if the publication of Dens spread demoralization, it is but for a time, and good fruits will come from it. I must observe that Mr. Maguire was mistaken in saying that I derived *morose* from *moralis;* I said that it was derived from *morari*, which is all the same as *moror*, as both have the same root. Then he says that Protestantism is without principles: and yet he says that all we have of Christianity we derive from his church. Thus we derive some of our religion from him, and yet we have no principles. Did I not say that your church was pure in the beginning, and that what it had of pure Christianity we have retained? Why, my dear Sir—my dear Sir, how can you fall into those mistakes? are you not ashamed of your errors? Mr. Maguire says, in speaking of Constantinople, that he quoted from Thorndyke and others. Did I not say before that I don't care a straw about Thorndyke and the whole of them? I take my authority from the laws of the land, because I quote from the homilies of our church, and the homilies were established by the laws of the land. I said that the Douay Bible points out Pagan Rome as the Babylon of the Apocalypse; and it is very strange that he should follow Thorndyke and others, and abandon the authority of his own Bible. Again, with respect to *Raca*, he says that of the different sins pointed out in that passage, only one is liable to hell fire; yet I have shown most clearly that the first is liable to hell fire, as much as murder; that the second, being subject to the council, is equally bad; and that the third, which ought to be considered as less than the two former ones, is subject to hell fire. Is there not common sense in that? He says that the word *procession* is not to be found in the Bible. Now I rather think that I remember having seen in

some passage the expression that the Holy Ghost *proceeds* from the Father: but I shall make myself sure. Yes, here I have it—John, chapter xv., verse 26, says: "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, &c." Here we have the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father. Again, he says—the word Trinity is not to be found in the Bible. I say, if it is not in the Bible, it is in the Athanasian Creed, which accords with the Bible; but I don't recognise the word infallible, because it is neither in the Scripture nor in the Athanasian Creed, though I grant you will find it in Johnson's Dictionary. Ah! the Roman Catholic Church has got an able advocate in my reverend opponent. You perceive how he wants to put off Peter Dens; he absolutely disowns him. O! he does not recollect his speech in Glasgow—that celebrated and everlasting speech in Glasgow—where he undertook to prove Peter Dens not less pure than the word of God itself. It was, I admit, a very clever speech—it was cried out in every corner of the kingdom. When I heard an old woman cry out "the celebrated discussion between Hugh M'Neil and Father Maguire," I bought it; and lo! it was the speech in Glasgow. Again, the discussion between the Rev. Mr. Magee and Father Maguire was nothing but the self-same speech in Glasgow! (Here Mr. Gregg read extracts from Mr. Maguire's speech in Glasgow, containing his challenge, beginning, "Let any of them come forward," &c.) He said that he would prove every-thing to the satisfaction of honest John Bull. I know that John Bull is kind-hearted, but it is to Protestantism that he is indebted for that quality. Now, I come to Mr. Maguire's answer to my arguments on Dens' Theology. He says that the whole question depends on this—namely, whether Christ instituted confession. I say it is not so. Here we have in the Protestant Book of Common Prayer, in the visitation of the sick, the following rubrics:—"Then shall the minister examine whether he repent him truly of his sins, and be in charity with all the world, &c..... Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter; after which confession the priest shall absolve him, if he humbly and heartily desire it, after this sort." And here follows the form of absolution: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his church to absolve all sinners, who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thy offences; and, by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, amen." Here then we have our church admitting the form of confession; but does that prove that we should follow the system of Peter Dens, or that the corporation of bachelors should pry into the secrets of our wives and daughters? Confess your sins to one another, says Christ; pump the young women, says Peter Dens; examine them on such circumstances as must corrupt them, and pollute your own souls. There is no more reason why you should pump females because Christ instituted confession, than there is that you should refrain from eating meat on Friday, because John the Baptist was beheaded. You will ask what is the purport of it—why should such a thing take place? I answer that it is because it was invented by the devil. You know that the great object of the devil has always been to torment men, and he torments the Catholic priests with a vengeance. He first prevents them from marrying, and then he exposes them to the most inconceivable torture. Mr. M. says that they are not allowed to make their vows before the age of twenty-three, and that they are then

old enough to judge whether they should do so or not; but I deny that that age is sufficient, or that a man could, at any time, possess sufficient knowledge of himself to enable him to come to such a resolution. They invariably find that they were wrong, and I appeal to every Catholic priest who hears me, if he has not felt that he was wrong in making the sacrifice that he has done. I assert, boldly, that there could not be a more meritorious or more excellent act than for all the priests in Ireland to marry all the nuns in Ireland (hisses, followed by cheers from Mr. Gregg's party, and loud cheers from the Rev. Mr. Nolan). There could be no greater demonstration of good sense, and I am convinced that no circumstance in the life of the great Luther was more noble than that of his having carried off the nun, Catherine. My friends, the character of that great man has been most vilely mistaken and misrepresented. There was a height, and a breadth, and a depth, and a vastness about him, which exceeds any thing I ever knew in any other; he was greatly superior to his times, and I doubt very much whether it be true that he would allow a man to marry ten wives together. However, I don't care a straw about Luther. Formerly, when I heard extracts from his works, I entertained a strong dislike of him; but subsequently, when I came to know him better, I felt the highest admiration for him. As to his deriving some of his doctrines from the devil, you must be aware that that is only a calumny; it was no more than a temptation, and you know that Jesus Christ himself was tempted. Now, let us proceed to see what our bachelor priests are instructed in, in their seminaries—in what their infamous system of divinity consists. Things which I say you (the priests) have no right to know, and which you are prevented by your circumstances from knowing. (Here Mr. Gregg read a great many of the translated extracts from Dens' Tract on Matrimony, where he treats in the chapter, *de usu matrimoni*, on the sins incidental to the married state). Remember that it is a Roman Catholic Doctor who speaks—they are not my words—blame me not. Oh! what a foul and infamous abomination! You, bachelor priests, you talk of the ————, you pry behind the consecrated curtains of the marriage bed! O, my Roman Catholic brethren, if you would but open your eyes—if you would but consider what I have laid before you—you would, every man of you, withdraw your wives and daughters from such a system of abomination. [The rev. speaker read some further extracts of the same nature.] Fie on it for an abomination! What a nice discussion for bachelors! Why, Sir, what do you know about those things? Where should you get your knowledge? I know well that the Roman Catholic priests of Dublin will say that Mr. Maguire should, instead of having come to this discussion, have staid at home with his dogs. It is a delusion—a most unaccountable delusion—if you do not feel that the whole of that which I have but commenced to read—that the whole system of Romish confession—the whole of the ecclesiastical education of your clergy, is most monstrous—most abominable—most infamous. The half hour terminated here.

Rev. Mr. Maguire—Gentlemen, I beg leave to say that I would rather go out to the fields with my dogs to take rational exercise than occupy my time reading the lying, infamous, and ignorant translation (I assert it to be such, and I will prove it so)—which he has quoted. (Here there was some noise and confusion at the lower part of the reporters' table, owing to some persons crushing to procure seats). Now, is it not a

shame that you cannot behave yourselves, and act in a rational manner during a rational discussion. See, I do not get disorderly.

A voice—Nor I.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—Why, then, make this noise? Are you not ashamed, and do you not remember that you are told to bear with one another. I implore of you for the future to be quiet. Now, gentlemen, you will bear in mind that I did not bring about the abominable exhibition of this day, and that whatever injury is done to our common Christianity, and whatever scandal is given to the faithful, that I, who occasionally go out with my dogs to enjoy some rational exercise, rather than read such passages as it has pleased my rev. friend to read, am not to be blamed. I tell you, my friends, notwithstanding the quotations which you have heard, that this is a glorious day for the Roman Catholic religion—(hisses). Give me none of your hisses. I made you hiss yesterday, and I rejoiced at it, for it is the sign of a better feeling having taken possession of you, as the snake when it hisses is harmless, and it is the snake that bites in silence that is to be feared. Still I say let there be no hissing. My party, if I have any party here, do not hiss him. Why should you hiss me? I beg of you not to continue it, but to exhibit towards us, and towards one another, a Christian feeling. Now, I will ask the Rev. Mr. Gregg a question, and I beg of you, my brethren of the Protestant church, to bear it in mind. Will he take the Book of Genesis, and read of the sin of Onan, or will he read the prophet Onias, and several other passages in the Holy Scriptures, which I can point out to him worse than any he has read, and which I would not take all the money in the world to read here to-day? Now, what good did all the quoting to-day do his cause? I speak now of Peter Dens in the original, not of my friend's false translation. I deny that Dens avows that a single one of those questions which you complain of are put in the confessional; but I leave that with you and him—you seem to agree very well with one another. Now, I say the great question to be decided is, did Jesus Christ establish the necessity of confession? I pledge myself to prove that he did. Now, if he did, are you, when confessing, to select what sins to tell, or are you to tell all? We see what kind are your youth, who either never acknowledge their faults, or acknowledge only such as they like. If they were instructed as ours are, you would not have them growing up in the commission of sin, such as you have named. You would not have your bishops hanged for beastiality, or flying from the country to avoid the punishment of Sodomy. You know, and I know, that in all the transports leaving this country, not a single crime of this nature is ever heard of; and, on the contrary, it has been proved that none of them leaving England are ever without it. This has been distinctly proved before the Commissioners of Inquiry. I can bring the report of the Poor Law Commissioners to prove that in England, Protestant England, no less than 74,000 bastard children are born every year, and that there is not a married woman out of five hundred that has not had a bastard child. I will read you this, and show you that we have it in evidence, and that evidence is the evidence of Protestant clergymen. I will show you, by the same testimony, that there are women who have had nine children by nine different fathers, and that the more children she has the sooner will she get a husband. We have it on a similar testimony that in Ireland if a woman had an illegitimate child she might as well leave the country, for she never would get a husband. There's a contrast to

moral and Protestant England, with its 74,000 bastards annually. But this immorality is not confined to the lower orders, as I shall prove. How many women of the very first rank and fortune annually run away from their husbands, and not merely that, but exchange husbands with one another. Search Doctors Commons and it will tell you. Now, name to me fifteen women of rank in this country, from the time of the Reformation down to the present day, that have either run away from their husbands or exchanged with each other, and I will give up the case. We know, Sir, how your young men proceed. Sir, it is well known that we keep our youth from crime, and that the detestable habits you enumerated are not among us, but among you. I will produce Dr. Sherlock's table of sins, which contains all the crimes you named, and worse, all of which he recommends to be confessed; and he is a Protestant divine. I will show you that your church approves of confession, while it throws away the best and most valuable part of it in discountenancing the telling to the clergyman all your sins in private. It is known that your flocks go to receive the sacrament at your altars with all their sins upon them. I myself have known them, after a night's debauch, to go from the scene of it to the church, and there receive the sacrament without a question being asked, or an inquiry made as to the state in which they were. St. Paul says, "Let a man try himself, and then eat of that bread." Now, I will come to the point, and unless I transfer the blush of shame and confusion which he endeavoured to cast upon us, upon himself, never believe a word that I say. You will read in the Scriptures where our blessed Saviour had the paralytic let down to him by cords through the roof of the house, because there was too great a crowd around the door for him to enter, and when he saw him he had all the scribes and pharisees around him, who were just of the same character that our modern scribes and pharisees are, and entertained exactly the same opinions with regard to the forgiveness of sins. And when he saw the paralytic, he said to him, "when he saw their faith, 'Son thy sins be forgiven thee.' But there were certain of the scribes sitting there and reasoning in their hearts, 'Why doth this man thus speak blasphemy? Who can forgive sins but God only?' And Christ, knowing their hearts, said, 'Why reason ye these things in your hearts? Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, thy sins be forgiven thee, or arise, take up thy bed and walk? But, that you may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, he saith to the sick of the palsy, I say unto thee, arise, take up thy bed and go thy way into thine own house;' and immediately he arose, took up his bed, and went out before them all;" and it is added that 'the multitude gave glory unto God who had given such power unto man." Mark, then, here we have, first, the scribes and pharisees holding, like those of modern days, that man has not the power of forgiving sins. Next, we have Christ, the Son of Man, forgiving the sins of the sick man and performing a miracle to prove that he had such power. Now is not this a proof of the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins? I address myself in love and charity to my Protestant brethren, and I beg of them to follow me through my demonstration. Our Saviour said to the apostles, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven." And before, "As my Heavenly Father sent me, so I send you." That is, he gave them all the power that his Heavenly Father gave him, and he sent them to do all that he himself had been sent to do. He had the power of forgiving sins; therefore taht

was among the powers that he gave them. Again, when after his resurrection, he met eleven of the apostles, St. Thomas being absent, he gave to them the same power. He also said to them, "Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins you shall retain they are retained;" and let me ask how could they know them unless they were confessed? Let me ask any physician how could he know the disease of a patient unless that patient minutely detailed all its symptoms, and all the circumstances accompanying it? Our health depends on the care we take of our body, and our salvation depends on the care we take of our souls. It is also my belief that my salvation depends on the care which I take of the souls of the flock that have been committed to my charge; and how can I take that care if they do not tell me their sins? Now, I will prove to you that sacramental confession was practised by the apostles. You, of course, have read, in the Acts of the Apostles, of Annanias and Sapphira. Their fate proves that if you tell a lie before the tribunal of confession, God will either visit you with some immediate judgment, or, what is worse, he will treasure it up against you for the awful day of judgment. Annanias went to Saint Peter to confess unto him, and he told him a lie with regard to the money, the produce of the sale of his property, and Saint Peter said that he lied to the Holy Ghost, and he was immediately struck dead. Sapphira came in just as his body had been borne out; she knew not what had happened to her husband—she also lied to the Holy Ghost, and was also struck dead. Now, that confession must have been sacramental, otherwise they would not have lied to the Holy Ghost, but to a mere man. Annanias might have done what he liked with the money, for it was his property, and if he had told the lie about it to St. Peter not in confession, God would not have visited him with so signal a judgment. There was no law compelling him to give up his property, but when he denied having kept any of the money he lied to the Holy Ghost, because the confession was sacramental, and St. Peter was there as the representative of Christ. You will not deny that there is a great difference between a lie to a mere man and to the Holy Ghost. You will not deny either that this was a lie to the Holy Ghost; therefore, you must admit that it was sacramental confession. You read also in the Acts, that "many came to the apostles, confessing their sins." And what were these sins? Among other things, the reading of improper books, and, after their confession, they went and burned those books, to the value of five thousand pieces of money. Now, I will prove—and, gentlemen, it will be worth your while to hear the demonstration—that there was auricular confession in the old law, and that the people were obliged to confess their sins. If then—now mark this—if then there were confession in the old law, it follows that there should be confession in the new, for the old law was but a type and figure of the new, which was "founded on far better promises." Now, you will find it laid down in the Old Testament, that God said to Moses, "Say to the children of Israel, that if any one shall commit any of all the sins"—(now mind that expression)—"that happen between man and man, he shall make confession thereof;" and then he provides for the sins of theft, if confessed, and says, "And he shall make restitution thereof, and one-fifth part over." There, now, is confession, restitution, and satisfaction in the old law—and then recollect the expression "any of all the sins." That is to say, that any sin, no matter what it is, must be confessed. Now, I will give you another text—St. James says, "Confess

your sins one man to another," that is, they were to confess their sins to man, but the men to whom they were to confess were the ambassadors of God. Now I ask any man of common reason to make sense of these words, "Whose sins you forgive, they are forgiven," and "Whatsoever sins you shall loose on earth, they are loosed in heaven; and whatsoever sins you shall bind on earth, they are bound in heaven." Now, how can it be known what sins are to be loosed, or what are to be bound, unless they are told? I put that to you. Answer it. Suppose, again, one were to go to confession to a minister of the Church of England, and suppose he were to confess, for example, some of the sins which he enumerated, would it not be necessary for the clergyman to find out whether that was his first offence, a falling-off to which all are liable, or whether he was an habitual sinner. If it were his first offence, there would be good reason to suppose that he was worthy; but if he had committed it one, two, three, four, five times—if he were an habitual sinner—give me leave to ask am I to throw pearls to swine?—am I to absolve him, and suffer him to receive the divine sacrament? Have I not evidence in the one case that the penitent has fallen, through the common weakness of humanity, and that he will be likely to avoid sin for the future? have I not evidence in the other that the man is swallowed up in depravity? and am I to treat them both in the same manner? But I would treat them in the same way if I did not know particulars. Would you not consider there was a difference between the young man who would rob but 1*l.* and him who would rob his master, say 2*l.* a month regularly? You would. But then your doctrine says, "Go on; rob on regularly; persevere; you do it with impunity." Now, he talked of our advertising the fact of restitution. We do it, not for the sake of publishing it to the world, but to convince the person who makes it that we restored it, and the man to whom it is restored that we have given all we got. And is not that a legitimate reason? Now, to come again to the point, will he name the name of a single person, from the second century down to the present, except when the locusts came upon the earth, that ever denied the validity or propriety of confession? Will he name a single individual, until "the bottomless pit was let loose," until Luther and Calvin's time, that ever raised his voice against it except heretics?—no, I do not even except them, for they admitted it. Now, "let the galled jade wince." I will now refer you to some of the ablest of your own divines. I refer you to Montague's "Guide," and his "Appeal," page 312. (He read the passages.) There it is for you. Priests have power not only to pronounce the words of absolution, but to give remissions. What do you say to that? I refer you now to Bishop Andrews' sermon to the English court. (He read a passage directly in favour of auricular confession.) I will now read Doctor Dowd's work—"Innovation unjustly charged on Papists." (He read several passages.) And now for the celebrated Luther, who never said a word against confession till he had five conferences with the devil, which he has preserved, and which he got translated into English. Here it is. The half hour ended here.

Mr. Gregg—Gentlemen, I tell you that one amongst the reasons for which I came here to-day is because I feel myself particularly engaged in a holy work in revealing to the world the abominations of this church of Anti-Christ. It is your business to consider whether or not my reverend opponent has disproved what I have asserted. I consider it a holy work, and I hope it will produce holiness in our common country. My

reverend opponent has adverted again to restitution which he says is so often made in the Catholic Church. No doubt it is paraded in the newspapers to show the world that it is practised in no church but the Church of Rome. I tell him again there is restitution in our church, that there is no member of our communion who does not feel himself bound to give restitution for any injury he may have committed. I have known instances of it as such myself, and as often as in the Church of Rome, though it is not made a parade of, in order to make an impression on the public mind. The reverend gentleman has been fighting with shadows in contending for the right of confession. Why, I allow the right of confession exists, but not with a corporation of bachelors. Was not, I ask you, his argument a most laboured and fatiguing account to show that confession was an institution belonging to his church alone; that is, in other words, the right of "pumping females?" He talks, as a proof of that, of Annanias and Sapphira being struck dead for telling a lie to the apostle, who, he says, belonged to his church; and the reverend gentleman says, "my faith is in Him who sent me," who declared, "I send you to preach and to teach, and, behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." He forgot to remind you of this fact, and I assert it, that his church is the church of Anti-Christ; and then he does not prove that the apostles were those of his church. He He speaks of the females of England. Now, consider this question with a large eye. I appeal to you as men, if that fact be true. I was in England myself, and went there prejudiced against it, from the accounts given by the Roman Catholics. I went there expecting to witness every kind of abomination, and I solemnly assure you that, in point of chastity and moral honour, the two sexes stand eminently high; showing the true nature of the religion which they profess and the purity of the doctrine that is taught them. The reverend gentleman says that in England a great number of females have children before marriage; and that in Ireland a female who once makes a slip—when once she forfeits her honour—that none will marry her, and that she becomes an outcast on society. I have known in England, and I believe it is generally the case there, that those females who misconduct themselves are generally married to their seducers, and that they afterwards lived examples of purity—good and faithful wives. I have known them thus overtaken in faults, and, when afterwards married to their spouses, living, as I have already observed, an example of virtue to those around them; whereas the poor unfortunate female, I will not say in Ireland, because I honour her—and there may be exceptions in the Roman Catholic world—but I do say the very system practised by the Church of Rome, and too often in this country by others, drives those females who have made a slip, into desperation; they are shut out from society, and become abandoned and profligate—spreading ruin and desolation wherever they go to—this under the influence of the Roman Catholic Church—until their crimes stink in the very nostrils." Let him confine his view to England and Ireland. He says we had bad bishops; but did the church defend them? And why does he then introduce them as instances of our religion being a bad one? I will show up the system notwithstanding all he has put forward, and give you a list of Popish bishops and abbots who have been guilty of crimes not by ones or twos, but by dozens—aye by scores—who were guilty of the foulest abominations.

A voice in the crowd—Name them.

The Rev. Mr. Gregg—It is on record. Let me take any Catholic country—Italy, Spain, Portugal, New Orleans—and when my reverend friend and myself compare notes, then we will see who has the advantage in this respect. A traveller who went to New Orleans once told me that he was present at a ball there, where nearly two thousand ladies were, among whom there was not one proper character. Look at Italy, where scarcely such a thing is known as a lady without a paramour; and it is a fact not to be disputed, that there is scarcely a house of ill fame in England that cannot be traced to the same cause—namely, the prevalence of Popery. I have mentioned these facts to show that the reverend gentleman has not it all his own way; but we must come to principles. The reverend gentleman talks of the practical observances of his church. I say he does not know the way to heaven, and that if ever those observances did exist, the Church of Rome did not practise them. He says, "how can we remit sins unless we know them?" I say he does not know the way to remove them. I say that sins cannot be removed unless by lifting up our hands to Jesus Christ, who is the Saviour of sinners.

[Here a tremendous rush was made at the outer door, which created much confusion; but, on the earnest entreaty of the Rev. Mr. Maguire, order was again restored.]

The Rev. Mr. Gregg then proceeded—That is the faith of Jesus Christ which shows men the corruption of their own hearts, and intreats them to look at the cross of their Saviour; it is by this we cleanse the entire man. What is the practise of the Church of Rome? It is not by admitting their flocks to righteousness, it is not by making them radically pure, but it is taking and subdividing iniquity, just as if a house were defiled by filth, and that I should tell the person to put it all out, but who only removed the mere scum and left it as bad as it was before. That is just the same way as the investigation made by the church into the souls of men, calculated to make the human heart more foul instead of cleansing it. He talks of absolution! I say his absolution does not remove sin, because he is the minister of Anti-Christ. His absolution is not that of Christ, and I tell him that if a man left his heart and soul to Christ Jesus, and that the properly authorised minister pronounces absolution, his soul will be cleansed from all her iniquities. I have a confidence in kneeling before my God, and through the faith which I have in Christ Jesus, that my sins are forgiveu me through the ministry of my church. I have practised the maxisms of his life, and I have a right to expect that peace which the world cannot give. It is not by gratifying the propensities of priests (not that you, Mr. Maguire, may not be an exception) that the souls of men are to be cleansed. It is not by telling the people they are angels, while the world knows they are different from what they seem, that salvation is to be obtained. I shall read out of your own books extracts to show the iniquity of the Church of Rome—books which you put into the hands of young men at schools. Oh, Sir, you ought to tremble and sink into the earth on account of the abominations which you lend yourself to promote. [The reverend gentleman here read an extract from Baillie, and continued.] The priests of Rome have reason to dread me. The Lord has granted me the the power of making these resolutions, which I perceive by your faces are making a beneficial effect on you. These are the men who are looked upon as angels and as God. Have you ever heard of St. Francis de Salis, a vile, odious old man. He, too, belonged to the corporation of bachelors, and was one of

those demoralizing physicians who have exhibited themselves in every Catholic country. Look at America, glorious America! descended from Protestants. Look and contrast South America with it, descended from Popish Spain, debased, degraded, and despised. Look at Italy, the land of slavery, anarchy, adultery, and assassination. Look at Spain, where despotism and crimes of every degree have attained a frightful magnitude? What have we now but confusion in every nation where Popery exists? the hand of God being evidently upon it. Look at Portugal, where man is against man, and woman against woman. Look at all these, and contrast them with every Protestant country in Europe. Look at our country, glorious, happy England! The next day of the discussion I will produce the Breviary here—I will show you that a wretch who lived in the ditches, and in the fields, clothed with rags, and covered with vermin, is set down as a saint among the other saints. This fellow, the filthiest of the filthy, is thus, you see, raised to a dignity in the Popish Church. The reverend gentleman has not touched one of my arguments concerning the apostacy of his church—he has not shown the true road to heaven, but, forsooth, he talked of absolution, and I think I have shown to your satisfaction that that absolution is invalid. I will now show you the slavery which Popery brings on married women. (The rev. gentleman then read an extract from a work written by St. Francis de Salis, we believe the "Introduction to a Devout Life," and continued.) I have also a prayer book called the Ursuline Manual, which is recommended to young ladies educated in Ursuline convents. It tells the young woman there may be sins committed in the marriage state * * * I tell you he will never be able to persuade the people that such things can exist. The reverend gentleman has said there are venial sins and mortal sins. I say there are not. I have read to you the thirteen rules given by Baillie * * * Oh, look at the pure fountain which springs from Protestantism. The half hour here ceased.

The Rev. Mr. Maguire then rose—Gentlemen, you have heard from my reverend opponent a great deal about bachelors. Oh, any thing but that for your reformers! They cannot or will not allow that at all. Yet the Lord Jesus Christ was a bachelor—the holy and sacred Mary was a pure and immaculate virgin—the great prophet St. John the Evangelist was a bachelor. But this will not do you, Mr. Gregg, nor it did not do honest Luther. O, no; a fig for what the founders of Christianity did! What care you for the example set an admiring world by thousands of holy virgins of both sexes in every age and in every clime. That is nothing—the purity of their lives was nothing when compared to your modern reformers, who possess the spirit, and who think a wife as indispensably necessary to them as their salvation itself. Are you aware, Sir, that certain privileges were conferred upon those, even in the days of the apostles, who consecrated their virginity to God? And, Sir, we keep public company with females, and instruct them in the way of salvation; but we do not, like you and your modern parsons, keep private company, because we have made a vow to God. If we renounce our solemn promises, as you, rev. Sir, would recommend us, we would be instantly divorced from the church of Jesus Christ, that pure and holy spouse to which we are united. No, Sir, we shall not do it. The Spirit may inspire you, but we belong to the religion of holiness and purity, which teaches us "that he who loves the danger shall perish in it." You lift up your hands to Jesus Christ, and blasphemously proclaim to

the world that you are inspired. Oh, Sir, the cloven foot of fanaticism will soon be discovered, and mankind will soon be convinced that you have not the Spirit of Jesus Christ or his church; that yours is a canting, robbing, hypocritical church, alike detested by God and man. The church of Christ you admit was in existence for 800 years; pray, rev. Sir, let me ask you where was yours, eh? Where was the Spirit, then? Oh, yours is a spirit of lethargy, of cant, of hypocrisy. Mine, blessed be his holy name! is the Spirit of God. You call St. Francis de Salis —one of the brightest luminaries of antiquity—an old vicious man; pray will you show me in your church one that was his equal, even in Fox's lying martyrology? and then you will succeed in doing something for Protestants. Gentlemen, I am running over those little things which he has put forward, in order to show you the ignorance of this poor man. You tell me I did not answer your arguments concerning the apostacy of my church. All I can say is, that the public are the best judges. It is now before them, and will be published more fully; and if they say that I have not, I'll give up the discussion from this moment. You talked of a house full of filth and of "pumping females." What a pretty expression for a man possessing the Spirit. How can you clean a house unless every nook and corner of it—even a mouse or rat hole—are searched? You would sweep it *in globo*, and tell your hearers to look to Jesus Christ and to the Spirit, and the house is cleansed. How ridiculous your nonsense is about the Spirit. Every madman, every brainless, senseless fool, talks about Jesus and the Spirit; but who, do you think, would believe them? Such doctrine, such cant, may stand good in your eyes and other deluded men like yourself; but will any sensible man think you are in earnest? You have, Sir, brought me here to this discussion, and in the presence of God I do declare that I am heartily sorry for it. I am sorry for your own sake, I am sorry for many of my Protestant brethren whom I esteem and love; and believe me, I would much rather be enjoying rational amusement with my dogs—that I would prefer discharging those duties which my vocation requires, than be here listening to the most absurd trash I have ever heard, and the foulest blasphemies ever uttered. Is it not a miserable thing, that in a discussion like this, you should have the audacity to quote the hearsay of every lying traveller with whom you may have conversed. That is not the manner in which I have acted—that is not the way in which I shall act; for, depend upon it, I have something here (pointing to a heap of volumes), and that too given on oath—men who are none of your venial liars, or who would tell lies for God's sake. Gentlemen, I beseech of you to mark and weigh well what I am going to read for you. It is taken from Pilkington's Parliamentary Reports. A Mr. Creswell states, that cases of bastardy were very numerous (in a parish in Durham, we believe the rev. gentleman said), that sixty-two were generally on the overseers' list, their expense amounting to one shilling and sixpence a-week—that three sisters had children by one man, that man being married before that they had been sent from another parish to the one in question, where they had two children again by the same man, and that they were sent to the House of Correction. Again, a woman named Mary White, had eight children by two different men, and the evidence is wound up by stating, that the total expense of supporting them amounted to 74,000*l*. There's Protestant England for you—Bible-reading, canting, spiritualized England. I will give you more—there is

the evidence of the rev. T. D. (you see he has a T. D. likewise) Burton, rector of Norfolk; hear what he says—"It is sufficiently notorious that promiscuous intercourse is become common among the sexes. Indeed, it seldom, if ever happens, that marrirge is contracted with honour." Did you hear that, Mr. Gregg?—there is spirituality for you. Again, the Rev. John Monk, Rector of Drayton, says—"I offered a premium to every female who would come to be married without having had a child previously, and I found that out of seventy-two who came only two got the premium; and it was afterwards discovered that even the two were pregnant a few weeks before. Gentlemen, public decency forbids that I should give any more of these horrible and disgusting abominations. I regret that I have been obliged to do so, but I could not avoid it. Now, Mr. Gregg, what say you? Let us compare country with country, the morals of those who go to confession and those who do not, and see on what side is the balance. I did not come here to attack the people of England, but your abominable system of morality, your fallacious, fanatical principles, your false and absurd theories, which are never practised—a system which leads to ruin and degradation, and lets loose the fierce passions like so many demons out of hell to rip society asunder. Look at your children employed in the mills and factories of England; take one county, and is it not notorious that the Roman Catholics of Lancashire would sooner see their children drop dead than send them to any of these places? Such is the frightful extent of vice and immorality which prevail. Look at Lord Byron's letter to the Venetian Consul, where he talks of the nuns as contrasted with the lewdness of some of the ladies in England; and lewdness carried to such an extent, that with shameless effrontery they proclaimed it. If I talked of your bishops, it was only to show the system was defective, and that your Protestantism without principle will not do. You promise the most notorious libertine a cheap salvation, for he is only to lift up his eyes to Jesus and he is saved. But there is another circumstance connected with the immorality of the English people which I was near forgetting. In the reports of Pilkington, which I have already quoted, page 241, we find the following:—"A man named John Cottle was engaged to be married to a young woman, but who, however, turned out to be with child by another. The young man, on being pressed to marry her, said he'd rather list in the soldiers; but he soon changed his mind, and actually used to go to the parish church for the money that was allowed to support the child; thus making his wife's disgrace a means of obtaining money. We all know what description of persons the higher ranks of English ladies are. The duchesses, countesses, and b——s; and the gentlemen who play handicap with their wives. Those do not get that instruction, so absolutely necessary, which is invariably given in the tribunal of confession; if they did, such conduct would not exist to be complained of so often as it is. I have already called on Mr. Gregg to read passages from the prophet Hosea, but, with a characteristic effrontery and shamelessness for which he is so remarkable in theological disputation, he does not do so. Look, Sir, at your own Testament, and you will find that any man who had an impure dream at night, dared not go into the temple the next day, or assist at the sacrifice of a cow or a heifer, which was a symbol of the new law, without washing and purifying himself; and we know that David and his followers were refused bread by the Lord until they had declared themselves. * * * Luther and Calvin were not content

with one spouse, for they took them in scores, a true criterion truly for those who follow the doctrines of Jesus Christ. I'll show what kind of characters these men were, if we should continue for six months. Hear what honest Luther says in his 1st tome, chap. 5, on tribulations:—"While I was a Roman Catholic I was fond of watching, and prayer, and fasting; I kept my solemn vows, was truly obedient to my superiors; but now I am all on fire; I burn, and in fact cannot without a * * *" These are the saints, according to you, Sir, and our system is damnable and idolatrous; yet our degraded priests are gladly taken by you, without even a new ordination (what we wouldn't do), although they had been the disciples of and ordained by Anti-Christ. What mockery—what humbug is this. It is Protestantism without principle, who, notwithstanding all, take even the degraded priest from the w—— of Babylon. On the consecration of these men they rely, and what a system that must be. Hear what Melancthon says of this aforesaid Luther:—"I tremble when I think of the dreadful passions of that man; he is puffed up with pride—with the most infernal passions, and to me it appears as if the devil had converted him into a demon." Henry VIII., that pious (!) head of your church—Mr. Gregg described him as if he were taken possession of by ten thousand devils, for what, think you? for rebelling against the doctrines of the Catholic church—that visible church of Anti-Christ upon earth. Hear what Conrad says of Martin—"God punished him for his pride, and abandoned him to the spirit of lying." And Luther himself says, when speaking of the principal of that sect to which you belong, "He is an arch-heretic; he satanized, persatanized, and super-satanized—infused and transfused—that the devil was with him, in him, and all round about him (great laughter). Erasmus, when speaking of Luther, said that it was much to be regretted by all good people that he was so arrogant; that he had the spirit of, and was delivered over to, the devil. Calvin says—in very truth Luther was extremely corrupt, and that he was disfigured by vices of the most disgraceful kind. These, Sir, are the kind of men who have denounced the Church of Christ, and designated her as that of Anti-Christ. And you, Sir, deny that Christ ever gave her, but in theory, power to forgive sins, although she has practised it unremittingly for 1,800 years, and your own church 70 years, and then, apostate as you are, you abandoned it. Hear what Dr. Sherlock, a Protestant writer says, when writing a table of sins * * * * The reverend gentleman then read the table, which contained the most disgusting language. You, Sir, continued the reverend gentleman, have no absolution in your church—you cannot absolve a man or woman—aye, or a cat (laughter). For eighteen hundred years we can prove our possession of that sacred power; do, if you can, or if you dare, prove that we have not, or at what period, or in what century we were deprived of it. You said the Pope had never the power of forgiving sins—and now, I ask you, would he or his successors have the audacity to exercise it for eighteen hundred years, and would mankind permit it, had it not been a divine authority? That is something like your cloven doctrine, Mr. Gregg. Your damnable doctrine also teaches that marriage is dissolved by adultery, thus encouraging that detestable and abominable crime. If a man then got married to an old woman, and that he gets tired of her, he has only to invite a friend to drink claret with her, and he'll soon perhaps get rid of her, and get one, like George, the head of your church, fat, fair, and forty (laughter).

Marriage, dissolved by adultery, is a doctrine held by your church, and from the testimony of Saint Paul, the apostle of Jesus Christ, I will convict you, and if you are capable of blushing, you will do so. In his instructions for marriage, he says, "It is good for a man not to touch a woman; nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband; let the husband render unto the wife due benevolence, and likewise also the wife unto the husband. The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband, and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife. Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer, and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency. But I speak this by permission, and not of commandment. For I would that all men were even as I myself; but every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that. I say, therefore, to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I. But if they cannot contain, let them marry; for it is better to marry, than to burn, and unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord. Let not the wife depart from her husband; but, and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband, and let not the husband put away his wife. But to the rest speak I, not the Lord, if any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away; and the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him, for the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband, else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." 1st Corinthians, 7th chapter to the 15th verse. St. Paul talks of married wives betaking themselves to prayer and fasting. Pray, Doctor, have you done so lately (loud laughter, in which Mr. Gregg heartily joined)? You come here attired in your pontificals to-day to make an impression, I suppose, by introducing subjects which ought never be mentioned in a Christian assembly. You must show, Sir, that we have not the Spirit of Jesus Christ—you must prove it from Scripture and from the Holy Fathers; for the world will not be content with your ranting, canting, hypocrisy. "Woe to them that are married and depart from their husbands," says St. Paul. Commit adultery, and you are at liberty to separate from your husband, and marry again, says the Protestant church. So that if you commit fifteen adulteries you can get married to fifteen wives. "Let every one abide by his calling," says the same Apostle; and Sir, I have made a vow when I was not more than twenty-three or twenty-four years old, which you recommend me to break; but—The half hour here closed,

Mr. Gregg—Shall we go on with this subject on Monday?

Mr. Maguire—Just as you like.

Mr. Gregg—Let it be known that I am not a party to its being postponed.

Mr. Maguire—Why, I don't care if you continue it for six months. I'll leave it to the chairmen.

The Rev. Mr. M'Namara—I'll not be a party to have the ladies excluded.

The day's discussion then ended.

SIXTH DAY.

MONDAY, June 4th, 1838.

This day the discussion was resumed. The hour of eleven having arrived,

Mr. Gregg arose and said—I call on Mr. Maguire to proceed with the subject of this day's discussion; and, before he commence, I call on him to say whether we should not prolong the discussion this day to three o'clock?

Mr. Maguire—I say, no.

Mr. Gregg—Remember, then, that you have refused.

Mr. Maguire—My friends, I hope most sincerely that, by the intervention of Sunday, a happy influence has been wrought in the mind of my reverend opponent. I hope that, through the interposition of God's blessing, since Saturday's discussion he has been restored to the equilibrium of reason, the self-possession, the moderation, the meetness which should distinguish a Christian controversy. No man can regret more than I thus being obliged to make any observations which could wound the feelings of my Protestant fellow countrymen. National reflections are always illiberal, and always tend to engender uncharitable and unhappy feelings. Comparisons of that nature are always odious; and I beg of you to observe that if I have made any attack upon the people of England, it was only to defend the people of Ireland; and I am sure that the people of England are too sensible, too rational, to censure me for doing that which the conduct of my reverend opponent compelled me to. I have endeavoured to keep him to the subject until it should be fully discussed, but I have found it impossible to do so. He has wandered from one subject to another as quick as his imagination could lead him. At one time he spoke of purgatory, at another, of the invocation of saints—then of transubstantiation, then of confession, then of relics, then of holy water, then of rags, and I know not what. Now, I appeal to any man if the way to conduct a rational discussion, so as to give the best opportunity to judge who was right and who wrong, would not be that no subject should be abandoned until both parties could bring forward no more arguments on it, and that thus the public might be able to judge between them, otherwise such a controversy as this could never be terminated. I now come to my turn to bring forward some additional arguments that the Church of England, with all its branches, is not the true Church of Christ.

Mr. Gregg—In these kingdoms.

Mr. Maguire—I have said the Church of Christ, with all its branches, and of course I mean in these kingdoms. I always understand the proposition in your own sense, and I never intend to quibble on it. I have pledged myself to give a direct argument of what I intend to prove, and I always keep my promise. I will then do that which I have pledged myself to. You have heard a great deal about the vows and celibacy of the Church of Rome. Now, if Scripture be against me on this subject, I must and ought to admit that we are wrong, and I am prepared to try my strength by that test with the champion of the Church of England; he

is indeed the champion of a great church, one which is very powerful in the good things of this world, in the temporalities of life, and I am proud of the opportunity of confounding him by the word of God in the eyes of the world. A great deal of clatter, then, has been made about those things, that is, the vows of our church, which are said to be contrary to the Scripture; but I say that our church is more ancient than the Scripture itself, and that it existed before the time of the apostles. But I will argue with him on his rule of faith, or, at least, what he pretends to be his rule of faith, for I shall show you that in truth he has no rule of faith. He says that the glory, and prosperity, and wealth of the Church of England is a proof that she is the Church of Christ; now, I will beg of him to bear in mind that, by the words of Christ himself, poverty was always a mark of his followers and of his church, (hear, hear, from Mr. Gregg), and I say if wealth, and splendour, and prosperity, be a mark of the true people of God, was not pagan Rome more powerful and splendid than Christian Rome? and let him look at the great bear of the north, Russia—is it not a splendid and powerful empire? and what will he say of France in the days of Napoleon, when it made the whole world tremble? What do you think, Rev. Sir, of the persecutions and poverty of the infant Church of Christ in the first centuries of its existence? According to you there could be no greater marks of its corruption, and of the divine displeasure, than those sufferings. I shall now refer him to the Book of Numbers, chap. xxx., verse 2, &c., and mark, my friends, it is his own authorised Bible which I use. It is there said, "If a man vow a vow unto the Lord, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond, he shall not break his word—he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth. If a woman also vow a vow unto the Lord, and bind herself by a bond, being in her father's house, in her youth, and her father hear her vow, and her bond wherewith she hath bound her soul, and her father shall hold his peace at her, then all her vows shall stand, and every bond wherewith she hath bound her soul shall stand; but if her father disallow her in the day that he heareth, not any of her vows, or of her bonds wherewith she hath bound her soul, shall stand; and the Lord shall forgive her, because her father disallowed her." My reverend friend, may reply that those things to which they bound themselves were already the subjects of commandments, and that it was only to enforce the fulfilment of those commandments that such vows were permitted. Now, observe that a woman who would thus bind herself was under the eye of her father, and that he forbid her, she would not then be bound to fulfil the vow? But how could that be if she had been already bound to it by a commandment, which, whether her father willed it or not, she was obliged to fulfil. I expect an answer to those arguments, and you will see, my friends, whether his texts or mine shall be the stronger or the clearer on the subject. I next refer him to Deuteronomy, chap. xxiii., verse 21, which says, "When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it: for the Lord thy God will surely require it of thee, and it would be sin in thee. But if thou shalt forbear to vow, it shall be no sin in thee. That which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt keep and perform; even a free-will-offering, according as thou hast vowed unto the Lord thy God, which thou hast promised with thy mouth." Here it is said, that "if thou shalt forbear to vow, it shall be no sin in thee," clearly showing that what was vowed, had been made the subject of a previous commandment; and again—I pray you attend to this—a vow is called a

free-will-offering, and as such becomes binding under penalty of sin. So much for voluntary vows; and again, Ecclesiastes, chap. v., verse 4, "when thou vowest a vow unto God, defer not to pay it; for he hath no pleasure in fools; pay that which thou hast vowed; better is it that thou shouldst not vow than that thou shouldst vow and not pay." Thus showing clearly that a vow is a perfectly voluntary act. I shall now come to St. Matthew, chap. xix., verse 12, where is it said—"For there are some eunuchs which were so born from their mother's womb; and there are some eunuchs which were made eunuchs of men; and there be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake." Here those of the third class are evidently persons who have bound themselves by a vow of chastity, and it is thus that the text is explained by St. Augustine, *De Virginitate*, chap. xxiii. In Luke, chap. xviii., verse 29, it is said, "and he said unto them, verily I say unto you, there is no man that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting." Now, clearly, we are not all bound to do those things—to leave our houses and friends—and yet, if we do them, we shall be rewarded according to the words of Christ. In 1 Corinthians, chap. vii., verse 25, we find it said—"Now, concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord; yet I give my judgment as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful." Here St. Paul gives us, not a commandment, but an advice, and what advice could be better than that of St. Paul's? and in verse 32, "But I would have you without carefulness; he that is unmarried, careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife;" and in verse 38, "So then he that giveth her in marriage doeth well, but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better;" and verse 40, "But she (the widow), is happier if she so abide after my judgment; and I think also that I have the Spirit of God." In 1 Timothy, chap. v., verse 9, the Apostle recommends that none but elderly widows should be admitted into the number of deaconesses; and that those who are young, and who would be likely to marry again, should not be allowed to make any vows. Now, I have nineteen Holy Fathers to support the interpretation which I give to those texts, and to show that the practice of the primitive church corresponded with it. I shall quote St. Augustine, and a canon, which will be admitted by my rev. friend. The 104th canon of the Council of Carthage, at which St. Augustine was present, says that if any widow who shall have vowed her widowhood to God, and shall have appeared in widow's weeds as such, and shall afterwards enter into a secular marriage, will be damned. Here we have a council pronouncing that, and which must be admitted by my rev. friend, because it was held at the period when he says the church was pure. St. Paul, in the same epistle to Timothy, says that some who had broken their vows had turned away to Satan. The Apocalypse describes the virgins as those who are nearest to the lamb, and who precede him wherever he goes, clothed in robes of white. I hope and expect that all those texts shall meet with a reply from my rev. friend (hear, hear, from Mr. Gregg). I shall now beg leave to examine a few of the articles of the Church of England, and try how they will bear the test of truth. Here is their 6th article—"Of the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for salvation.—Holy Scripture con-

taineth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the church." Now, I put the Church of England to her trial on that article, and I say by that article she must fall. I beg your attention, my friends, most earnestly to this subject. According to this sixth article, no book can be admitted as a part of the Holy Scripture which was ever doubted by the Church of God. But he admits that our church was once the Church of God, for it was, according to him, pure in the beginning. Now, we have some of the books, at present admitted to be canonical, not received as the word of God by the church in those ages of her purity. Thus Eusebius, as translated and published in Oxford, an edition, of course, which my friend will admit—the Valasius edition of Eusebius quotes Dyonisius of Alexandria, who is described as a most learned man, and the greatest critic since the days of Longinus, and who says that the Apocalypse is not the word of God. He said that the Greek was most barbarous—that it was full of solicisms—that it bore none of the marks of being genuine—that the language or style had no similitude with that of the Gospel of St. John, or of the Epistle of St. John, and that it was not written by the Evangelist, but by some other John. He quotes St. Irenæus, and several others, who were of the same opinion. Here, then, we have such an authority as that of Eusebius telling us that the Apocalypse was not received into the canon of the Scriptures by the Church of Christ in his days ; and we know that not only the Apocalypse, but the Epistle of St. James, and the Epistle of St. Jude, and the Epistle of St. Peter, and the second Epistle of St. John, all of which are looked upon at this moment as canonical by the Church of England, were not received by the whole Church of God, whether you call it the Protestant Church or not, for the first 400 years after the establishment of Christianity. I call on you, Sir, to show that the authority of those books, or any of them, was never doubted by the Church of God, as the articles of your faith require it should not. I have shown by various authors that it was ; and you are well aware that Luther himself doubted them, and would not admit them into the canon. But I return to the Holy Fathers, and I ask who was Eusebius, whom I have quoted ? It is on his authority alone that we know any thing of the history of the Christian Church for the first 300 years after its establishment ; and here we have him telling us that those books were not admitted by the church in his age, nor were they until the year 397, and they were not even then admitted by the Council of Carthage, which, although not a general council, is yet received by the church ; for there the question of their canonicity was referred to the authority of the church beyond the sea, that is, the church of Italy, which was to be consulted before they could be admitted as a rule of faith. You talk about our *Index Expurgatorius* ; I have it here to show it ; it proves how careful we have been since the earliest ages what books we admit or approve. Thus, when Marcion, the heretic, said to St. Polycarp, do you admit my authority ? the latter answered him, I admit you to be the first-born of the devil. In the 119th page of his history, Eusebius quotes Dionysius, of Alexandria, as saying, " I received this canon (of the holy scriptures) from Heraclius, our blessed Pope." Thus,

at least, in the time of Dyonisius, of Alexandria, the Pope was not Anti-Christ, for we find that even then he was called blessed. Did any one ever before hear of a blessed Pope? Having now said so much on that point, I shall now come to the 19th article, which says, "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." Here, then, we have a visible church, in which the sacraments are always to be administered. But again it is said that the church was invisible as a church for 800 years and more. Now, I ask, how could the sacraments have been purely administered in an invisible church? or rather, how could they have been administered at all? How will my friend reconcile that invisibility with the unity and catholicity of the church? How will he reconcile it with the apostolicity of the church, if he cannot show a regular succession of bishops and parsons in the church from the time of the apostles to the present moment (hear, from Mr. Gregg)? I will also ask him this question: St. Paul says, in writing to the Collossians, that the church is the body of Christ; but if the church be the body of Christ, how could it corrupt or die? St. Paul says that it is his body. Now, even the physical body of Christ did not corrupt; how, then, could his spiritual and moral body, the church? How could there have been any one to represent him—how any visible head on earth—if there was not a man, woman, or child in the whole world, for 800 years and more, who could see a visible church?

The half hour was concluded.

Mr. Gregg—Our friend, Mr. Maguire, is a sporting character, and I suppose he has heard of the man who went one day to shoot, and who, not having the very best aim, and having fired among a large flock of birds, replied to his friend, who inquired if he had killed many, that if he had not killed them, he had caused them to leave that. 'Tis thus with my rev. friend. He drives me away from things which I wish to reply to, and then he tells me that I have not convinced him. What can be more unfair than that? I say that he has not answered my question, and that the subject of vows is far from being finished by him. Then, in addition to the vows, he has taken two of our articles which he has attacked, and called on me to defend. Now, how am I to answer all those things? and again I ask is that just? But, as I said before, I begin to smell an Atheist. I smell him very strongly, burning brimstone! You admit the Book of Revelations. I say, Sir, you must admit it. Let an infidel come to me, and I will have arguments to meet him with, but do you not cast away the word of God, lest the denunciations contained in that book should fall upon you. The Spirit of God had many and various things to say unto man; and if any book in the whole Bible manifest in it the word of God, by its dignity, and force, and sanctity, and prophetic spirit, that book is the Revelations. Are you not ashamed, Sir, to deny the authenticity of that part of the Divine Word? O my Roman Catholic brethren, tremble, tremble I say, at this mark of Popery! All my reply is this:—Dr. Cousins, in his "Scholastical History of the Sacred Scripture," has proved the authenticity of the Revelations by arguments which have never been answered or denied; and further than this I will not fritter away the time of the audience by replying to so futile a question. You must be a Roman Catholic priest, Sir, I insist on it. Again, I hear you say that I have said the true church

was invisible. How often shall I deny the allegation? I said again, and again, that it was only *respectively* invisible, and yet you will be at it again. I say that the stream of truth was always to be found in the church. Now let me make an hypothesis: Suppose that Mr. Maguire should now speak in such a disrespectful manner of the word of God, that the whole audience, disgusted by his language, would leave this room, with the exception of two individuals; I say, might not the morning papers announce that the whole audience was driven away by Mr. Maguire's abuse of the Sacred Scripture? Why talk to us about Henry VIII? Luther says that he flings him off, and so do I; I fling him up to Mr. Maguire. Henry VIII. lived and died in the abomination of the Romish church, whose thraldom he flung off. Now, as to the true church being invisible, observe what Luther says—that if Huss, and Wickliffe, and Jerome of Prague, and many others, were heretics, he also was a heretic, and if they spoke the truth, he also spoke the truth; clearly showing thereby there were always some who professed the pure doctrine of Christ. Do not then say that I have asserted that the church was corrupted so as to be invisible. Let such an assertion not go forth to the public. Does not the Scripture say that many are called and few are chosen? I say that many Papists were called and few were chosen. Again, our Lord says, enter not by the wide gate which leadeth to damnation; for narrow is the gate and rough the path which leads to eternal life, and few there are who find it, thereby signifying that his church may appear as a very small and trivial number. Now the Book of Revelations is like a mill-stone about the neck of my rev. friend; and it would have been better for him had it been a mill-stone, and tied about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should come here before mankind to scoff at and mock the Word of God! Are you not aware that the outer Court of the Temple of God should be trampled by the Gentiles, that is by Christian Rome paganised, and that the inner Court should be guarded only by the two witnesses; and again, that the beast who would come out of the pit, aye, the beast with the seven heads, and the ten horns, and on which sat the woman who rode over the Kings of the world—the beast, I say, shall kill those two witnesses, so that it might appear that the church was perfectly invisible, and yet it was not so. O don't father on me this wild opinion.

Mr. MAGUIRE—I refer to the notes.

Mr. GREGG—And so do I. The sun shines, does it not? Well, suppose a cloud should pass over it so as to prevent us from seeing it, would we say, for all that, that it does not shine? Again, suppose that a quantity of gold were mixed up with base metal, who would deny that there was gold in it, and that the chemist could separate it from the other? The Church of Rome is the base metal—the Church of Rome is the husks, while the true church was cognizable to those who had the Spirit of God. I thank God, yes, indeed I do, that I have derived spiritual grace and comfort, and strength from the exercises of the Sunday. Now, there were two subjects brought forward by my reverend friend, namely, vows, and the articles of the Church of England, and which of them shall I take—the vows or the articles? If I take the vows, don't let it be said that I have not answered the articles, for I have not time for both. I ask, have I not gone on the severest principles of reason since the commencement of this discussion? I first take the general principles, and I then proceed to the details. It was thus that I treated the subject of

miracles, and I finally went into the more minute deductions from them. I first assert that vows were admitted in the Old Testament, for there is a vast difference between the two. Thus, if water which had been blessed, was used in the old law, it was no argument for holy water in the new, where we have the fountain of life open, and which is the fulfilment of the types and figures of the old law. Again, if oil was used in the old law, we have the unction of the Holy Ghost in the new; and it would be the most beggarly infidelity to go back to the Jewish ages for their typical practices and customs. Here is the distinction between the old and the evangelical dispensations. The whole use of the old law was to set men to obtain self-knowledge, to set men on endeavouring to keep the commandments. It was in fact a dispensation of vows; and the vows were destined for the purpose of making men imagine that they were bound the more strictly to fulfil the law. It was the schoolmaster to teach the way to Jesus Christ, and all the commandments were also bound by vows, in order to the same purpose, viz., to lead to Christ. Hence it is clear that the existence of vows under the old law could be no argument or authority for the use of them in the new particularly; as those vows are opposed to the known spirit of the New Testament. This latter proposition, viz., that they are opposed to the spirit of the Gospel, I now proceed to show. But before I come to texts and to details, I shall say a word or two on the nature of the New Testament dispensation. It is, that it confers on men a new power, by conferring on them the gifts of the Holy Ghost, the whole being to bring them to Jesus Christ, for which purpose a new nature is given them, according to that which is said, "And I will in those days pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." Persons before followed nature; now nature follows them. Before, men were bound by vows to keep the commandments; now, were the door open freely to sin, they would not enter. The delight of the Lord is in beholding his people, and seeing them run in his commandments, without being bound in the shackles of the old law. I will now take a few texts to show that vows are contrary to the spirit of the Gospel. In the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, chap. viii., verse 21, it said, "because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Mark that, my friends, the glorious liberty of the Lord under the new dispensation, as contradistinguished from the old. And in 2d Corinthians, iii, 17—"Now the Lord is that Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Yes, my friends, there is liberty, and stand fast in that liberty which you have received. St. James, 1st chapter, and 25th verse, says—"But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed." And 1st Peter, chapter ii, verse 16—"As free, and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God." Here, then, my friends, we have a contrast between the two dispensations; and are we not bound to retain that gospel liberty which the Lord Jesus has conferred upon us, and tie up our hands, and surrender it without any cause? But I shall refer for a moment to a text from St. Matthew, quoted by my reverend friend, and much relied on by him, viz. "And some there be who make themselves Eunuchs for the kingdom of God's sake." Now, on this subject I would wish to make an observation, which I believe I should do in Latin, *Lisez libros eorum, et dicite anne ipsi Eunuchi sunt? Lisez librum*

in quo tractatur de———— (we omit the words). No one, I am sure, can be scandalized at that. They are the chaste men, forsooth; why, such subjects are contrary to your state, and the position which you have chosen. But I have no objection to monasteries and nunneries, as many as you please, provided the monks and nuns be at liberty to leave them and get married at any time they might wish. It is to the bonds which I object; to the tying up of the hands and will, and the giving away of the liberty of the Lord. I now come to the text about widows in the Epistle to Timothy; "And there I will hew him to pieces by the Lord in Gilgal, with his own sword." Yes, I take his very texts out of his mouth, and prove from them the very contrary of that for which they were advanced by him. I did so when treating of the difference between mortal and venial sin, and I do it now from the text of Timothy. This text, my friends, refers to a widows' alms-house. Thus, you perceive, I first give you the key, and now I come to the interpretation. The fact, then, was simply thus:—They had an alms-house for widows amongst the faithful in Corinth, just in the same way as we have them in this country; and the advice of the Apostle to Timothy was that none but old widows should be admitted, and that the young widows who would be likely to get married again in a short time, should be excluded. If, indeed, an old widow sometimes found an old gentleman who was willing to marry her, he might have her, and there could be no objection to rid the parish of the burthen of her support. Is not all this very plain? It is the simple meaning of the words of the Scripture. And now, my dear Sir, how could you have mistaken or misinterpreted it? I go on principles; and I protest that I give you my very heart and soul in the sincerity with which I point out the meaning which appears to be shining out of God's word, so as not to be mistaken but by the wilfully blind. I now come farther on in the context, where this meaning is still made plainer. It is here said, that if the widows should have any children, or nephews, or other near relatives who could support them, they ought to be suffered to do so; thus clearly pointing it out as a charitable institution. Mr. Gregg's half hour here terminated.

Mr. Maguire—It is for you, my friends, to judge whether he has answered me in any one of the proofs which I have produced, according to the form in which I have put them; or whether he has put them to you in that form. He first calls me a sporting character, and he next tells you a story. I must admit that he tells you a great many stories, but they are of that kind which are designated as old women's tales. He then touches on no fewer than fourteen different subjects, none of which were introduced by me, or which were in any manner connected with the principle which I laid down, namely, whether the question was not whether it was the will of God that men should abstain voluntarily from that which was otherwise lawful, and whether he might not lawfully bind himself by a vow to do so. I must, however, follow my reverend friend through his devious course, for we are like Siamese twins, and I am obliged to follow him, although he wishes to break the union between us. I am glad, indeed, that he is an anti-unionist. I think it no harm or dishonour that I should indulge in some harmless exercise in the country for the good of my health, and I am resolved to do so as long as God gives me strength. (Mr. Gregg, right!) He says that it would require an hour for him to answer all that I brought forward in my last speech. I am very sorry it should cost him so much time. He often gave me

twenty-four or twenty-five different questions to answer in one speech, and it is strange that I never complain. But I will endeavour to follow him. He tells you that he smells an atheist—rank brimstone!—now I appeal to any honest man who hears me whether—although I admit all, and every one of the books of the Holy Scripture which my reverend friend receives, and although I would lay down my life on this very spot rather than yield up one of them, however unmoved, and firm my faith be—I appeal to any honest and rational man whether I am not justified by the laws of argument, in retorting on him in the manner I have done? Why, Sir, I but retort on you, as a Protestant, your own argument; I only attack the sixth article of your profession of faith, and this I have done by proving that several books of the Scripture which you call canonical, were not admitted as such in the first four centuries of Christianity; and thus that a requisite condition for the canonicity, according to that rule, is wanting, and, consequently, that you have no means of proving your rule of faith. You are no fool, Sir, that you should mistake any argument, and there is not a schoolboy of fourteen years of age who would not understand what I did mean. I told you that you should reject your article if you admitted the Revelations, and that there was nothing, either in the Scripture or in the creed, which could authorize you to receive either. You see, then, whether you are justified in accusing me of mocking or speaking with disrespect of the word of God, or whether I should be accused of attempting to throw it overboard. For my part I never doubted for a moment of the integrity of any portion of the sacred Scriptures—I receive them from the hands of an infallible church, to whose word I submit—I receive them ratified by a succession of bishops uninterrupted from the days of the apostles to this present moment, and authenticated by the sanction of eighteen general councils. I have said over and over that the book of which we speak is the Word of God. It is received from that church from which you have received all that you have of Christianity—from which you have received your baptism, and your forms of prayers, and your hymns. You have, in fact, a book published in Oxford in the year 1838, which is nothing more than a translation of the hymns contained in the Parisian Breviary; and you appear, in truth, to be going back by degrees, until you shall have resumed all the doctrines and practices of the ancient church from which you separated. My friends, you have observed when Mr. Gregg was about proving the unlawfulness of vows from Scripture, how he stopped short—*vox faucibus hæsit;* he had not a word to say in the great demonstration which he promised you. But on a former occasion, instead of Scripture, he shewed you a picture! and never did I see any thing better calculated to contradict himself than that picture. Who ever heard of a stream which being cut off from the fountain head, still continued to flow? How long would it flow on in such circumstances? Alas! Sir, you are cut off from the fountain—whether you have been cut off by it, or whether you have done it yourself, matters little; you are cut off from the fountain, and you have run dry! (Cheers.) Let none of my friends applaud me; I beg that they will not. If we get off well in the sight of God, without the applause of men, all shall be right. This is a dangerous and an awful investigation, my friends; it is one which will shake the one church or the other; we have risked our lives in the contest, and it is a moral miracle if we survive it. Pray, then, my friends, to the God of justice and of wisdom, to the arbiter of right; but restrain your applause. My reverend friend

said that the Church of God is the pure gold, but that it may be mingled with dross; but I ask, how could the dross come from the fountain? how could it flow from Christ, who was the head? It is only by corrupt morals that the dross could creep in; but in the doctrines received from Jesus Christ the gold shall always be pure. And again I ask, if that gold were lost, if the church had departed from it, where would you find it again unless you stole it; and Jesus Christ tells us only to come in by the door! Did you observe how paralyzed he was when he attempted to get over the difficulty of the church having been hid for 800 years and more, by drawing a parallel between it and this room, if the impiety of my language drove every one out except two? Now, I ask, would not even those two be visible? So much for his parallel. But I ask, can the Church of God be reduced to two? And what is the meaning of the word catholicity, one of its distinctive marks, if it be not that the true church is extended more widely than any other Christian sect, which might otherwise be conformed with, or mistaken for it? Luther said—they are his authenticated words—"I in the beginning stood alone." "*Id casu non voluntate*, &c. I call on God to witness that it was not by design, but by mere accident that I fell into those broils with the church!" And so it was by accident, because the Pope did not give him a part in the preaching of the indulgences. Again, my rev. friend preached a most eloquent sermon to you on the difference between the old and the new dispensation. He is very eloquent when he wishes to show off his talent in that way. He says that according to me there is no benefit derived from the new dispensation. This I deny; for I assert that we are no longer bound by the legal observances and rites of the Jews; by their ablutions and purifications, and circumcision, and offerings, and sacrificial rites. But I ask, are not the ten commandments binding, although I know that Luther did not think so, for he said they were not? I do not say I smell a Deist, whether I might not say so with as much truth as you, Sir. I ask, was not God the author of the precepts in the old law, and could he have ordained any thing against morality? and what was morality then is it not so still? Whatever moral precept, then, was binding in the old law, the same is binding still; and I maintain that if vows were lawful and meritorious in the old dispensation, as by Scripture I have proved them to be, they are not less lawful or less meritorious in the new. When the young man mentioned in the Gospel said to our Lord, "All these things have I observed from my youth up," Christ said to him, "If thou wishest to be perfect, go sell all that thou hast, and follow me." Now I ask was the young man obliged to comply with that precept of our Lord under the new dispensation? If he think so, I wish he would go and instruct some of his rich bishops to give up their 30,000*l.* a-year, or at least to induce them to give some sufficient support to the poor curates who do the work and the slavery of the mission, ill requited, and scarcely preserved by their scanty pittance from the lowest destitution. How many have acted so in our church, and if they were not bound by precept to do so, were not such works of supererogation? I defy you to find two pages in the entire of Eusebius in which an example of such devotedness is not to be found; and you can not point out four pages of the same author where well-attested miracles of the early saints are not recounted. I know that in the old law they had but the promise of Christ, while in the new, we have Christ himself, his blood, and his Spirit. My rev. friend talks a great deal of the influence of the Spirit: did not Marcion say

that he was inspired by the Spirit, although St. Polycarp told him he was the eldest son born of the devil? and did not Montanus pretend that he had the Spirit? and did not both of them place private judgment above the authority of the church? Again it was said that the Church of Christ might have been reduced to two, without being relatively invisible, but I defy them to show any one visible member of their church for 1,500 years before the pretended Reformation—before the locusts issued forth from the pit. My reverend friend quoted a great many texts from St. Paul; now I admit every one of them, but I deny the deductions he draws from them. You say, Sir, that our church is the beast on seven hills, although you know that London is built on seven hills, and Dublin on seven hills, and Constantinople on seven hills; and that the name of Mahomet corresponds with the number of 666; and you prove all this from a prophesy which never has been, and never can be, understood until it shall have been fulfilled. I own it requires no ordinary share of patience to argue with a man who never gives a direct answer to any question. Thus, when I attacked your Articles, and defended the doctrines of my own vows, you come out by asking which of them you should take up. (Confusion, caused by expressions of disapprobation from some of Mr. Gregg's friends.) Now did I ever ask you which of your arguments I should reply to? If you admit, with the Thirty-nine Articles, that the sacraments have been always validly administered in the church, I ask in what church, from the time of Luther back to the fifth century, were they so administered? Was there ever a national church professing the doctrines of the Church of England? Here are Dr. Ball's Liturgies, and point out any of them belonging to a church, before the days of Luther, which agreed with him in his doctrines. Do you pretend that your church was the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church during eight hundred years and more previous to the Reformation? If you do, believe me, it will require something more than mere declamation and the empty effusion of a ranting spirit, to prove it. Cannot I talk about the spirit as well as you if I wish? (No, no, from Mr. Gregg.) Then, I suppose, I am not enough of the fanatic to pretend to that distinction. I belong to a church which pretends to common sense. The church is the body of Christ, but you want to prove that that body became corrupt, adulterous, and idolatrous. Where is your demonstration? I might put much stronger arguments than those forward, but I consider them sufficient, and prefer them, because they are obvious and easy to the capacity of the public; and if I do not receive an answer to them, I will not stand up in such a discussion as this. You admit that we had once the marks of the true church. I asked when did we cease to possess them? You then compared the church to a man's head, which becomes grey gradually. What an argument to apply to a church embracing a hundred and fifty millions of members! An individual may watch the progress of his own head becoming grey, but he is not observed by others. You will admit that the Church of Rome watched the rise and progress of other heresies with an Argus' eye, yet no one watched hers. You were a sleepy dog to keep so bad a watch; or I might call you one of the seven sleepers, for you slept for fifteen centuries, during which time you cannot tell what passed in the whole Christian world. Now, I can tell the very year in which every heresy that ever was broached made its appearance, from the time of Simon Magus down to those of Luther and Calvin, and Zuinglius, and Beza, and the whole host who followed in their wake. I can tell when

every one of them attempted to corrupt the pure stream of religion. But suppose that a heresy was broached in the Popish Church of Ireland, how could it have been spread, and that so secretly and silently, over every other part of the Christian world; or——

Mr. Maguire's half hour terminated.

Mr. Gregg—Gentlemen, did I not say that good would come out of this discussion, and have I not that proved from the allusion which my opponent has made to Luther and Calvin, that we are not the apostate church—and that his church is, as I will prove to you from scripture? "There shall be false teachers in those days," said the Word of God. Now, Luther and Calvin did not bring any new principles into the church; therefore they could not be the persons alluded to; and, consequently, I fasten the brand on you, Sir, as a deep and destructive dye, arising out of your damnable errors. There never was a true church that did not hold the Thirty-nine Articles to be sound doctrine, and taught by Jesus Christ. Does Mr. Maguire think to deceive us because they happen not to be exactly arranged, and found as such in the Scriptures, that, therefore, they are false? No, this supposition is false; and it is for you to show they never were held as the doctrine of the Church of Christ. He then says that there were, at one time, doubts entertained whether the Book of Revelations was canonical, and that Dionysius rejected it altogether as such in the early days of the church. What! is Dionysius the church? Here the church doubted it, because, forsooth, we have a Mr. Belcher denying that the Gospel of St. Luke has any ground for proving it is canonical. What care I for Dionysius? And it appears that its merits were debated by councils, and then again he says, "I believe in the Book of Revelations, because my church does." Now that is the very reason that I say the Church of Rome is an apostate church. I put it to the meeting whether one of my arguments to prove that apostacy, was from Daniel the Prophet, chapters 2 and 7, from the Revelations, from Peter, and not a single syllable has he said in the way of refutation. Did he bring forward a single proof in answer to what I had put forward? He says, "where did you get your mission?" I am astonished at such a question. Does he not know that all his bishops abandoned him, and that they left the corporation of bachelors? Our church is no separate church, she is no schismatical church, but the true church of Christ. You might as well tell me, that if a drunkard leave off that abominable practice, he is the same man. He says we admit his ordination—that is a gratuitous assertion—but, however, we do so in some instances. This, however, I tell him, that we would as soon admit a Popish priest into one of our pulpits as the very devil himself, until he was purified and cleansed from the foul abomination of Popery. Their ordination is partly corrupt, and partly right. You had first the authority which Christ gave, until you sold yourselves to the devil. I must speak the truth. It is rendered invalid by the foul corruption which has entered into your church, and, as I said before, we would not allow any Popish priest to stand in our pulpits until he removed the foul works of Anti-Christ. He calls on me for a text of Scripture to prove the church was corrupt; I could quote one hundred of them, not that the church was corrupt, because the principles which we got from her are not corrupt, and are at this moment gloriously spreading; but if you demand a text from me that the old husk at Rome was corrupted and rotten, I will refer you to the 17th chapter of

the Book of Revelations—"And upon her forehead was a name written Mystery, Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth—and I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus, and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration." That is the practice of Anti-Christ, to make the world drunk with abominations. The Popish priests have destroyed the nation.

A voice—They have priest-ridden it.

Mr. GREGG—Yes, the empire is priest-ridden, and I longed to expose the iniquities of the system which thus drinks the blood of the people. There's a text for you—now for another—"And the beast caused all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand or in their foreheads; and that no man might buy or sell save that he had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." Now let us see whether our church or that of Rome is that mentioned in those texts, and you will soon be convinced that that of Rome is the beast alluded to. *Vicarius fides* means 666, which in Revelation, is Anti-Christ—*Vicarius Episcopalus Filei*, is 666—*Divinis infallibitis*, is 666. All these in the Greek and Latin languages mean the same thing. Away! look, my Roman Catholic countrymen, and tremble for the consequences. The Rev. Mr. Maguire tells me that Luther had his doctrine from the devil, and that he was the devil's servant. I deny that he was a guilty character; on the contrary, he was a noble man. Surely we are not to judge of a man's character by any peculiar faults which he may have; and is it not justly due to him that we should take what is good and what is bad and compare them—then indeed we might come to a right conclusion. Are we to judge of Jacob's character because he told a lie, and deceived his brother of his inheritance? It was said on Saturday, that Melancthon described Luther as having devils within him and without him, and that they surrounded him. I should not be surprised if they did surround him, seeing that he was going to overturn their dominion; and does not that note the character of the man? The question is, did he yield to the devil, or did he subdue him. It is well known he did subdue him. And now hear what this same Melancthon writes of him after his death—"He was a man without private cupidity, and entered into the cause with zeal; and, although ardent and passioned, he was always mindful. He was a thunderer, but with the weapon of the Holy Ghost; and when I think myself how many great men were led astray in recommending persecution, I plainly assert that he always abstained from that crime." Gentlemen, he was a lettered man and a learned man, and I dare say my rev. opponent is deceived in him. I myself translated Luther's letter addressed to Henry the Eighth; it is in this book, and I recommend you, Mr. Maguire, to take it with you to Ballinamore, when I have no doubt you'll change your opinions of that great and glorious man. He says I am bound by the ten commandments—I say I am not. I am free—they are the rules to guide me to salvation and not to bind me. The Holy Ghost has imprinted them on my soul, because he has given me a conscience and grace to fulfil them. The reverend Mr. Maguire objects to my church—I want to prove the truth as in Jesus. I would say to Mr. Maguire, as I said to an infidel once in Carlisle (to whom I was taken by some friends of mine to be introduced), after stopping his mouth as I stopped Mr. Maguire in this discussion—"I have given you my princi-

ples, ask yourself are they frivolous? ask yourself are you happy in yours —you look for happiness, are you so?" After some time he stammered out, yes, I am. Then I said, if you are happy, you do not want Christ. So I say to you, Sir, if you don't stand in need of Christ, you do not want him; but if when you go home your soul is shaken, and that you feel miserable, say to yourself, how is my soul shaken. I have lost my popularity, in the first instance, by this discussion; and in the next, look at the dangers likely to result to that which I espoused; and if I were right in Christ, I would not be shaken. And, reverend Sir, if you consider thus, I have no doubt but that I shall receive a note announcing your conversion, and that you saw the error of your ways. Come to the Lord himself, and do not blaspheme him by depending on good works or on the saints, and look to him and him alone; give up the battle, and let Ireland be happy. I'll teach your heart that you can't be happy—it is impossible you could be so, for Popery is incapable of making any one happy. Fling off all, and come to Jesus as your bishops and clergy did of old. He is the Alpha and Omega; the first and the last, the only means by which man's salvation can be effected. The reverend gentleman talked of what Marcion said to Polycarp, and he argued that, because Marcion was a heretic, so were all those who separated from the Church of Rome. No, Sir, I am not a heretic; I belong to Jesus Christ. He quoted Timothy; now let us see how that text applies: "But if any widow have children or nephews, let them learn first to show piety at home, and to requite their parents, for that is good and acceptable to God. Let not a widow be taken into the number under three score years old, having been the wife of one man, well-reported for good works, if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work. But the younger widows refuse, for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry —having damnation, because they cast off their first faith." All these evidently apply to alms-houses, where poor widows used to be relieved. He says, are vows allowed or are they not? I won't say that a Christian may not take a vow; but you have no right to bind a man, and afterwards condemn him for breaking it. What I condemn is your anathemas —your denunciations, instead of leaving the matter between the individual and his God. Again, Timothy says, speaking of the widows, "she that liveth in pleasure, is dead while she liveth." What does that mean? not that vows were made, but that alms-houses existed, into which the young buxom widows were not allowed to enter. The apostle speaks of washing the saints' feet. That I believe is remembered at Rome to this day, for they are very cunning fellows. Suppose, however, that instead of washing the traveller's feet, houses were built for them, where they could be comfortably entertained, and let them be allowed to wash their own feet; that, I think, would be keeping within the spirit of the law. The Pope washes the people's feet for the purpose of keeping the cords of bondage around them tighter, so that he can trample on their souls and bodies, and keep them in bondage for ever. Again, it is said in Timothy, "And withal they learn to be idle, wandering about from house to house, and not only idle, but tattlers also, and busy bodies, speaking things which they ought not. I will, therefore, that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give no occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully." Does that text forbid to

marry? does it not state you are free to do what you may think proper, either to marry or not? Thus, gentlemen, am I going on, answering his arguments one by one; for I want to do it completely, and not *ad captandem*, as he wants to do. Mr. Maguire may think that I am not doing so, but in candour and in honour, I am endeavouring to do it. "Happy is the man that condemneth not himself."

The half hour here ceased.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—Well, the half hour is spent at last, and I venture to say there never was a man so puzzled as he was to waste it away. He evidently wanted to make a show, for he continued preaching for thirteen or fourteen minutes, without saying any thing at all applicable to the subject. All I can say is, that this will answer me very well when this discussion is published. One of the last observations which he has made I shall beg to call your attention to; and in doing so, I would beg to remind him of my proposition the other day—namely, that after a point would be discussed for two or three days, and that both parties were satisfied, it should then be final and conclusive. He comes here to-day, invigorated as the representative of Trinity College, and commences a subject which has been already disposed of. Have I not already quoted Saint Augustine, Irenaeus, and other authorities, to show that they wrote against the Manacheans, the Precilians, the Montanists, and others, for holding that marriage was unlawful, and denouncing it as a doctrine proceeding from the devil? They held there were two gods, one for good and the other for evil; but let me not exhaust my time about heretics. We say marriage is one of the seven sacraments. We hold it to be instituted by Jesus Christ, and is not that a guarantee for us that we do not forbid it? and would not common sense teach any rational man that such is not the case? I have gained some popularity, no doubt, from a former discussion; but you, Mr. Gregg, never had any, and of course never can lose it. Is it not a lamentable thing that such an assertion as that we forbid to marry, should be put forward, when every Roman Catholic in the room knows it is a foul falsehood, and when they know the instructions which we give, that the wife should love her husband, and the husband should love his wife? We tell them it is a clear and lively representation of that union which exists between Jesus Christ and his church, and as Saint Paul has it, "I say unto you, it is a great sacrament as a figure of that union between Christ and his church." Every sacrament is a mystery, but every mystery is not a sacrament—the Trinity for example. How could we forbid any man to marry if he thought proper to do so? What the church says is this: "I want clergymen, but I do not wish to force them into my service. If any man come to me for holy orders, he cannot be admitted unless he comply with what I demand of him; for as no man can serve two masters, neither can any man serve two mistresses. Saint Paul says the man that has a wife belongs to the wife; but he that has not belongs to God. I have shown you, Sir, to what straits you have reduced yourself in thus foully interpreting the meaning of the Apostles of Jesus Christ. You prevent the Fellows of Trinity College from marrying. You say vows are lawful, and that Jesus Christ gave liberty to marry; and yet, notwithstanding this, and though they make no vows, you prevent them from marrying. Why do you keep them in the corporation of bachelors? Answer that, dear Mr. Gregg. Is it not a wonder that you recommend me, who am bound by a solemn vow, to break it, and that you would not

tell them who chose to stay as they are, for the sake of pelf, to marry. You went over the texts of St. Paul; and you recommended women to take care of their children, and to bring them up in the way of virtue. Why, now, doctor, whoever doubted that? I am not, nor did I, when speaking of vows, allude in any way to widows who were at liberty to marry. I have only included those who make vows, and did I not quote for you St. Agustine's words, "De Virginitates?" to all of which I got no answer. You say you are inspired. You boast of it, and oh! let St. Augustine hide "his diminished head," and allow the rector of Swift's-alley to tell him what the Spirit is. Did you observe how ready he was with the texts of St. Paul; like an Irishman stamping potatoes, until he found himself obliged to read that text which alludes to the washing of the saints' feet? Do you recollect how he remained at least two minutes pondering over it to give an explanation, and ended by a sneering allusion to the practice as practised in the city of Rome, "What is it, says St. Paul, to prevent a woman to assist us as well as Cephas?" And now what did all these texts which Mr. G. has quoted, refer to? There were women appointed to be deaconesses in the chuch in the time of the apostles.—They received a species of religious orders, and went about with the apostles, instructing the young and the old women who became new converts, for the apostles could not let them know in private what they had taught in public, in respect to the rites and ceremonies practised by the Gentiles. This being done, they washed the clothes of the apostles, prepared food for them, and then joined in prayer and thanksgiving. It was only when some abuses arose, and that scandal was given on some occasions, that the practice was discontinued. Why did he hesitate in reading the washing of the saint's feet, as mentioned by the Apostles? Because he found that it recommended corporal works of mercy. That was contrary to his spirit, and you never, on that account, saw a man taken so much a-back as he appeared to be. He talks of alms-houses, in explanation of St. Paul. Now did he or myself ever deny that? The faithful had not public parishes at that time, and on that account collections were made at the different churches for the support of the poor Pagans and Jews who were converted to Christianity, and whose relations threw them away for going over to the new religion. What connection has that with what I said with regard to vows, and also as far as concern those who violated them? You will read about these alms-houses in different parts of Saint Paul's Epistles; and, again my brethren, you will see the next point to which I shall call your attention —those who break a vow which is binding in the sight of God and man, Would you have us tolerate that? Oh yes, I understand, you and your church, whose theory is loved, but the practice of whose doctrines is despised; do what you please, it is not resisted, for your church is like a new spiritual mushroom, careful of the manner in which she exercises her authority. The motto of King William III. was, "I did not take the kingdom, but I received it," and Dean Swift added, "that the receiver was as bad as the thief." So my friend, Mr. Gregg, says we received our ordination from you—we received the doctrines of the four first general councils, we have got the sacraments, our Liturgy—all, all from Anti-Christ. Bravissimo, doctor? Your ordination, your consecration, your baptism, are all from the church of Anti-Christ. You also took from us the sacrament of the Eucharist, but you gutted that, and left it without any substance whatever. You have nothing which you

have not received from us, unless your cant and hypocricy, although you do not scruple to charge us as being the followers of Anti-Christ. Here now is the sensible man for you, and the great advocate of Protestantism without principle. He says he does not care for St. Augustine, for he has the spirit of St. Paul, and every man's conscience will tell him whether he is doing right or wrong. That is the moral code; and again, every thing done in faith against conscience he tells you to follow. Now, if one has a fslse conscience he is bound to correct it, and bring it under the dominion of reason, and in obedience to the church---as, for example, if you mistake Sunday for a Saturday, that you were travelling in a packet, and that you forgot to pray, you committed no sin. Why? Because no man can commit sin but by his own free will; but the moment a man has heard of the mistake he committed, then he is bound to obey the dictates of his conscience, under pain of sin. Mr. Gregg has told you that Luther was a wonderful man. You know, Sir, that, under certain circumstances, I should also be obliged, if I were to speak of that gentleman, to give you a little Latin. You talked of a passage in the Gospel, where our Saviour said some men were so and so; did I not, Sir, give you St. Augustine's explanation of that passage, in which it was proved that it was meant in a spiritual sense? and did I not also prove it from the words of Christ himself? All men do not take his word, and so lead themselves into ignorance and error. I dare say that you are aware of Luther's confessions being translated by a learned and able Protestant divine---and are you well acquainted with the tremblings, the shiverings, the horror which Luther experienced, when the devil first paid him a visit? Do you recollect the reply? Eh! Doctor, "Good Doctor Martin Luther," said his Satanic Majesty, "why are you afraid of me?" Do you not know that he held out for saying mass against all the arguments the devil could use for a long time, and does he not confess that the devil convinced him by five special reasons? If you have not the book, I will bring it to-morrow, and ask you to translate it. If I do not compel you to admit every syllable of what I have stated, I will give up the discussion. Sir, you have again had recourse to Revelations, and I cannot but lament this contemptible shuffling---these shameful evasions. I proved to you that the two witnesses spoken of by Saint John, were Enoch and Elias---did I not show you that they would convert 144,000 Jews, and that the two holy men would be put to death in the very city in which our Lord was crucified? Did I not tell you that that was the real spiritual Jerusalem of the church? And more, did I not prove to you that the bodies of Enoch and Elias would lie in the streets for three days and three nights, and then come to life again? Did any of these things occur yet? If not, Anti-Christ is not come yet. Has not our blessed Lord said, "When another will come in my name, him you will receive." Have the Jews done so as yet? No, and therefore Anti-Christ is not come. Anti-Christ will have power to bring down fire from heaven---to work miracles, so as even to deceive the elect; and after all this, you answered me by saying, that time, and a time, and half a time, mean 1,260 years, instead of three years and a half; and I'll leave you to judge whether Saint Matthew saying the time will be shortened, fearing the just would be led astray, that it would be doing so by making it 1,260 years. I proved it from Daniel and the Revelations, that the time could not exceed three years and a half; and after this, Sir, dare you talk of the apostacy of the church of Rome, the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church

of Christ? And now I will adduce another fact which cannot fail to add to the confusion of every honest Protestant who hears me, and I am sorry for it. For one hundred and twenty-eight years after the first reformers made their appearance---those locusts from hell, which devoured the land---there were neither bishops nor altars, priests nor deacons. It was only at the expiration of that period that they came back to our standard. Invariably the Scriptures have been changed by the Presbyterians, who were the first Reformers. For example---Wherever the word church appeared it was changed into congregation; table was substituted for the word altar; elder for priest; and those whom my reverend opponent called officers for deacons; bishops were called overseers, (indeed a bishop may be an overseer, but an overseer cannot be a bishop). This was the villainy practised by those who tore asunder the seamless garment of Jesus Christ; but the moment you, and your churchmen, Mr. Gregg, got a fine church, and a splendid establishment, O, then you came back, and allowed the Anabaptists, and the Jumpers, the Presbyterians, and the sanctified Quakers, to go on as they pleased: but you were determined to come back again, and, accordingly, in one hundred and twenty-eight years after, as I have already said, bishop, and priest, and church, and altar, were again substituted. That shows the honesty of Protestantism—aye, Protestantism without principle. Sir, the only argument used by you to-day was that wherein you stated you were not called on to disbelieve the Apocalypse, because such a person doubted its authencity; but that your authority for their being canonical was the authority of the church. No doubt the Church of Christ knew what books of the Holy Scriptures were canonical and what were not. Saint Dyonisius was a first-rate saint, and a man of the profoundest abilities, though perhaps not so learned as Eusebius; and, Sir, do you mean to tell me that the church did know at this period or had decided what books were canonical, and that that decision, if in existence, would not be known to such men as Eusebius, Saint Dyonisius, and Irenæus? Do you compare these men to one of your fanatic preachers, who holds forth in your conventicles? I tell you there were no canonical books in these days, nor were they received or read in the public churches until a general council was called. Why? Because of the persecution that existed—of the bloody war which raged against the holy martyrs and confessors. They had not time to collect evidence to substantiate their canonicity until peace was restored to the church by Constantine the Great. How could then evidence be collected to do that during the existence of such a frightful persecution? Sir, I want to show how consistent it was that the eminent men of whom I have spoken should have doubted the authenticity of any book which had not been pronounced upon by the whole church. But your sixth article must go to this—you must either renounce it, or the Book of Revelations. I don't want you to reject the latter, but you must the reformed articles. Mr. Maguire's half hour here ended.

The Rev. Mr. Gregg—The Rev. Mr. Maguire taxes us with our sects and divisions, and I shall tax him also. He brought forward, on Saturday, gross charges against the morality of the people of England, and called them an immoral people.

A voice in the crowd—No interruption.

Mr. Gregg—I put then to the meeting to take up that point now, when it will be seen from where they sprung, and crept into the church.

Mr. MAGUIRE—You have no right to enter into this subject now, as it had been fully discussed on Saturday.

Mr. GREGG—Do you object to it?

Mr. MAGUIRE—I have no voice in the matter. My chairman will decide that. (Cheers and considerable uproar.)

Mr. MAGUIRE—Keep yourselves quietly, gentlemen, and decide rationally. I have no objection that my friend, Mr. Gregg, should go on if the chairman shall so decide.

Both the reverend chairmen consulted for some minutes, when—

The Rev. Mr. NANGLE said—I think it but fair to state, that as the Rev. Mr. Maguire has made some of what occurred on Saturday a topic for discussion this day, I think the Rev. Mr. Gregg has a right to refer to the subject.

The Rev. Mr. MACNAMARA—The Rev. Mr. Maguire did not make any thing that occurred on Saturday a subject for argument here to-day. He only apologised for being obliged to denounce the immorality of the people of England, and that he was led into it.

Mr. MAGUIRE—I am ashamed of the proceedings on Saturday, and for my part I consider them disgraceful to us both.

Mr. GREGG—I assert before the world that those assertions are false and caluminous.

Mr. MAGUIRE—I took what I stated from the sworn evidence of sworn parsons, and all I can say is that I'm in the hands of my chairman.

Mr. MACNAMARA—I will not allow a repetition of that most disgraceful and unchristian subject, nor will I sit in this chair and be, as a Christian minister, a party to so foul a transaction.

Mr. GREGG—I'll make this proposition—will Mr. Maguire sign this paper?

Mr. MAGUIRE—What is it?

Mr. GREGG—I'll read it for you—"I retract all that I have said with respect to the English women, and regret having made use of them."

Mr. MAGUIRE—If you retract all that you have stated with regard to the foul calumnies which you have dared to heap on the priests of the holy Catholic Church, and on the sacred tribunal of confession.

Mr. GREGG—I will——; but I can prove such as such.

Mr. MAGUIRE—And what I have stated I'll prove on the authority of sworn parsons.

Mr. GREGG (in great agitation)—Will you sign this paper?

Mr. MAGUIRE—Dare you say what I have stated are not facts?

Mr. GREGG—You have stigmatised us.

Mr. MAGUIRE—You were the cause of bringing so foul a proceeding before a Christian assembly, and I must say it was a rascally discussion.

Mr. GREGG—I flinch from nothing.

Mr. NANGLE—To satisfy all parties, I will propose to the meeting that another day be appointed to investigate the subject brought before us on last Saturday.

The Rev. Mr. MACNAMARA—I consider it is out of our power to interfere with the regulations agreed on before we entered into this transaction. We have received a law and sitting here, we are only bound to administer it. For my part, I solemnly protest against such an infamous and unchristian proceeding as that of Saturday.

Mr. GREGG—What made it unchristian? what made it infamous?

Mr. MAGUIRE—You will recollect that in the part which I was

obliged to take in that infamous transaction, I apologised for doing so. I gave my authorities, and if called on to do so again will feel great pleasure in doing so. That is all I have to say on the matter.

Mr. NANGLE—The proposition I have made is on the ground of fair play to all parties; let the onus, then, of the public odium, rest on those who shrink from it.

Mr. MACNAMARA—I shall feel honoured with the odium of preventing such an unchristian and disgraceful exhibition as we had on Saturday.

Mr. GREGG—Then I feel honoured with the odium of exposing Peter Dens.

Mr. MAGUIRE—I have no objection if we should stop here for a month, were it not that it is unworthy of a Christian assembly.

Mr. GREGG—It is unworthy of Christians, and that is the reason we should have it.

Mr. MAGUIRE—There is where you show the cloven foot. You can rant and cant, and boast of your possessing the Holy Spirit; but argument you have none.

Mr. GREGG—Will you apologise?

Mr. MAGUIRE—Apologise! for what? Perhaps I ought to do so for bringing them before the public; but there cannot be any doubts as to the facts.

Mr. GREGG—If you don't apologise, let me expose you.

Mr. MAGUIRE—I'll give you a day, if you promise not to use an indecent expression.

Mr. GREGG—I'll not state any thing that is not in Dens.

Mr. MAGUIRE—And I'll not use a single expression that is not sworn to by parsons before a committee of inquiry.

Mr. GREGG—Will you agree to name another day?

Mr. MAGUIRE—I'll agree to any thing which my chairman shall decide on.

Mr. GREGG—Then let it be to-morrow.

Mr. MAGUIRE—I'll give you a month for it, if you wish.

Mr. MACNAMARA—I'll not tolerate such an outrage on Christian morals; you have had my opinion already, and I beg we shall hear no more of it.

Mr. GREGG—I'll now proceed to refute the mis-statements of my rev. opponent; and first of all I say celibacy is the source of all abominations. My Roman Catholic countrymen, I beg of you to tremble for your principles.

Mr. MAGUIRE—I see now this turns out to be a mere party inquiry, and not one to discover Christian truth.

Mr. GREGG—I'll make the assertions put forward by my reverend opponent ring in the four corners of England. The Lord shall make my voice be heard, and I will make it so tell on the public mind, that it will be productive of the most tremendous results, springing as it does from lying and the foulest abominations. I am taunted with the multiplicity of sects which exist in our church; but let me tell him he should first of all prove they were Church of England people, because whatever abomination exists in England mainly springs from the Church of Rome. I have a book written by Robert Ware, son of Sir James Ware, the eminent Irish historian, who says that the Church of Rome, finding that the Protestant religion was gaining upon her in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, sent emissaries to divide them if possible, and thus by disuniting

them to destroy the religion altogether. That book was printed by James Wray, in the year 1683. The reverend gentleman next read an account of a man named Richard Simmons, who was tried in 1583 at the sessions of Gloucester, from which work he did not quote, but it appeared from what he stated that Simmons was sent over by the Pope to sow dissension among the Protestant people of England. I assert, therefore, continued the rev. gentleman, that any sects which have sprung up in the Church of England, are mainly and solely to be attributed to the Popish mother. It is for you to determine how far forth his explanation of Timothy will appear satisfactory. I say man is free, and that the practice of celibacy is a blundering abomination, the spawn of the old Church of Rome. I have asked him to answer my arguments about the apostacy; he has brought forward Enoch and Elias—I say we stand in the power of Enoch and Elias, and from what he has said of them I am more than ever convinced the Church of Rome is idolatrous. He says I have given him no answer to what Christ said, "him will you receive." I refer to his church, which is that of Anti-Christ, and which proves fully the Scriptures have been fulfilled. He says that a time and time and half-a-time, are near three-and-a-half years. I say say the language of Scripture has always been to represent days for years, and that his three-and-a-half years is no other than 1260 years. I allege it was the custom of the prophets to reckon days for years; I shall prove it in this way, and mark, gentlemen, how beautifully I shall prove it. I like to take matters not by cavils but by principles. I say three-and-a-half years and 1260 years are analagous; for example, beasts don't live so long as men, and consequently it is fitting that there should be a proportion in the calculation. They condemn a priest for marrying—that is, when a comedy follows a tragedy, they anathematise them; and I therefore say such vows are unchristian and abominable. I am well convinced that many Roman Catholic priests who are present tremble! I do say this, that if there were no other reason for the Roman Catholic priests to quit this foul apostacy, this should induce them. Don't you, Sir (turning to Mr. Maguire), forbid them to marry?

Mr. Maguire—Certainly, when they voluntarily come forward and make a solemn vow to the eternal God.

Mr. Gregg.—No one swears to God in your church, but to Anti-Christ (loud laughter). If there were Christianity among you, you would not permit those young men who don't know what they are about, to make these solemn vows; and I say that no one should be allowed to do so until he attains the age of thirty (hear, hear, from Mr. Nolan, who was once a Roman Catholic priest). These things are, however, drawing to a conclusion. This discussion has not been grappled with fairly by my reverend opponent. He has used no arguments (loud laughter). I have taken his texts and convicted him of error. His church is one of plunder and of blood. He says it is an infallible church. It is not—it is an abominable church, and we are the holy church of Christ. He says that we have not power to absolve a cat (loud laughter). No; certainly, we have not; nor do we read the Gospel for sick beasts. It is not, as is done in his church, that we pronounce absolution. Oh! no; when we pronounce that through Jesus Christ the sinner shall be saved, and tell him to look to Jesus, as I do, being the ambassador of the Lord; and tell him to rejoice and hope in the glory of God, that man receives real absolution in the spirit of purity and truth. On the contrary, when we see that the

penitent is not so inclined, we do not hold out such hopes for him. But a man who is thus truly penitent, is right with God, and he is washed in the blood of Jesus. Secondly, our absolution is instrumental, for it lets the soul to look to Jesus, and it is that which produces true holiness; and give me leave, then, to tell you, reverend Mr. Thomas Maguire, that when talking on this subject, you made a most flagrant mistake.—In quoting God's holy word you said, "whatsoever sins you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." I tell you there is no such passage in the Bible; it may do you in Ballinamore, but it will not do here. What a pretty theologian you are (laughter). You have talked of Henry VIII. I say he was (although he had many faults) a good man, and would not put up with the casuistical distinctions which prevented him from marrying his brother's wife. The Rev. Mr. Maguire talked of Dublin being built on seven hills, and London, and Paris, and Constantinople in like manner; but he cannot disprove the fact mentioned in the Revelations, that Rome is the city—that she is the seat of Anti-Christ, and——Here the half hour ceased.

We cannot conclude this day's proceedings without calling attention to the manner in which the apostate Nolan acted. On several occasions he exhibited a piece of paper in the form of a host, as if elevating it—conduct, we will not say blasphemous—which disgusted very many Protestants. We are happy to say, however, that all passed off quietly.

SEVENTH DAY.

TUESDAY, June 5th, 1838.

Mr. Maguire rose at eleven o'clock, and said, I call on Mr. Gregg to pursue the line of argument with which he intends to conduct the discussion this day.

Mr. Gregg.—Before I do so, let me ask my reverend friend whether we shall not continue the discussion, this day, until three o'clock.

Mr. Maguire.—I must object to that course, for I find that my health will not permit me to continue it to that hour.

Mr. Gregg.—Then, I am sorry for it; I am unfeignedly sorry for the cause of it, that my reverend friend's health should not, as I am sure he candidly says, allow him to proceed with the discussion to three o'clock; and I believe that every one in the room, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, joins with me in that regret. I am also sorry for it, because I had designed to introduce four subjects for discussion; but the want of the additional hour will oblige me to confine myself to three, the discussion of which will, I expect, be productive of the most salutary effects on all who hear me. In the first place, then, I shall fasten apostacy on the Church of Rome—that is, the denial of Christ; that they have, if not professedly, however truly denied the Lord Jesus; for, although they profess to serve him, as I acknowledge, yet they give him not that power which belongs to him, and attribute that power to other beings and other things. First, in proof of what I maintain, I shall refer to the text, 1st Timothy, chapter iv, verse 1, viz:—"Now the spirit speaketh expressly

that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and the doctrines of devils—speaking lies in hypocrisy—having their conscience seared with a hot iron—forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truths." Now, observe it is here said, the spirit speaketh, for the Greek word *Retos* signifies speaking openly, from the verb *Reo*. Here then it is said that the spirit speaketh expressly and distinctly, declaring that, in the latter days, many shall apostatise or depart from the faith, the word being *apostesontai*. It is then prophesied that an apostacy should take place, and it is then told what are to be the particulars and nature of the apostacy. "They shall forbid to marry and command not to eat flesh meat." Now, to those two latter points I shall more particularly fix your attention. The word "commanding" is not in the original Greek; but then it is understood, and is so admitted by my rev. friend, who applies the text to the Marcionites and Manicheans. Hence it is not necessary for me to enter into a long criticism to prove that such is the meaning of the text, though I show in innumerable passages that the connecting word, as it were, is left out. Thus in Chronicles, 29th chapter and 20th verse, it is said, "And all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads and worshipped the Lord and the King. Here a word is omitted, for it should have been that they worshipped the Lord, and paid their respects to the King. Such an omission is frequently to be met with in the Bible; and I recollect having met a parallel case in Lucian, where, though my memory does not serve me to quote it in Greek, it is said, "Oblige me to neglect the affairs of the dead, and injure the kingdom of Pluto," where there is but one verb to express two ideas. If necessary, I could bring hundreds of instances to the same effect, but I will not take up the time of the meeting in doing so. Hence the meaning of the text of St. Paul is, that they shall forbid to marry and eat flesh meat. But Mr. Maguire will say, that it applies to the montanists and other ancient heretics. Admitted that it does so, say I, but I also say that it applies to the Romish Church. Here we have the Church of Rome first permitting young and inexperienced persons to bind themselves by vows, and then subjecting them to the most dreadful pains and penalties if they should ever change their minds, and think fit to discontinue the observance of those vows. I don't object to a vow or promise being made; for instance, when I undertook to meet Mr. Maguire I made a vow, or took a resolution; but I object to the vows of the Romish Church, and to the manner in which they are made to bind. I shall first prove that those vows are Anti-Christian, and I shall then show that their results are of the worst and most injurious nature. This I shall show from the same—Epistle to Timothy, chapter iii: "This is a true saying, if a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity." Here then a bishop is spoken of as the husband of one wife, that is, not guilty of bigamy, which was so common among the Pagans. But, lest my reverend friend should raise a difficulty against me, by saying that he was to marry the church, that his marriage was only a spiritual one, I meet it by saying that it should be one "who ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection." Thus, he is even sup-

posed to have children; but I would not have my reverend friend say that I said he must have children. Again, Mr. Maguire may say that these are not his children, strictly speaking, but his lambs, that is, his flock; but mark how the Holy Ghost stops the mouths of the cavillers—just as if the Holy Ghost had said, I know that Mr. Maguire will cavil about this text, and I will prevent him; for lo! we have farther on, "For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God" (cheers from Mr. Gregg's friends).

Mr. Nangle.—I request that none of these demonstrations of feeling will be indulged in, as they are contrary to the express rules of this discussion.

Mr. Gregg.—I beg that you will mark the words, if he cannot govern his own house, how shall he govern the Church of God? But it may be said that it might do very well for a bishop to have a house and family, but that it would not follow that a priest should imitate the example. I am not afraid of the word priest, for we have adopted it in our church; we employ the name of presbyter from *presbuteros*, which signifies a ministering and not a sacrificing priest; the word became contracted to *prestor*, and thence to priest. But here I come to the priests and deacons, in the tenth verse—"And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless. Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well." Thus are the deacons, too, to be married men; they are to rule their houses and their children well; and if they be married, surely the priests are supposed to marry also. Thus do we see the practice of the primitive Church of Christ described in the Word of God; and so fully and clearly does the Apostle dwell on this subject, that Mr. Maguire must at least acknowledge that it is no wonder that the ministers of the Protestant Church should be mistaken in the interpretation which they give that passage, if that interpretation be wrong; but I am astonished, indeed, and that with grief, to see him, notwithstanding that explicit declaration of the Scripture, still standing up to assert that the marriage of the clergy was not permitted in the primitive church. The apostle then goes on to tell us of the apostacy which was about to arrive, and he describes it as expressly contradictory to what preceded, as forbidding to marry and eat flesh meat. And we have the very same identical thing taught elsewhere in the writings of the same apostle—viz., in the Epistle to Titus, where it is also said "a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God—not self-willed," &c. Here then is the apostacy fastened still more strongly on them; I should not say more strongly, but certainly as strongly as by the other text; and I here declare that I put those two texts against any which he can produce in support of the vows and celibacy of the priests of his church. But he talks of injuries and abuses against Protestant countries, and he is angry with us because we do not build splendid palaces, and amass properties for our nieces rather than for our own children; but, I ask, are we worse for having children rather than nieces to provide for. Or, when I go home after this heating work to-day, which is it worse for me to have, a wife before me rather than a niece, to comfort and take care of me? Now, mark the consequence of their vows. I have here a work taken from the Cottonian Library; it is a record of the crimes and abominations which defiled the Romish monasteries and cathedrals at the period of the Reformation, and which was drawn up by a Commission of Inquiry,

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

appointed for the purpose by order of Henry VIII. (Here Mr. Gregg read a great number of extracts from the work he described, enumerating crimes said to have been committed by the clergy at the time of Henry VIII., and collected by the order of that King, but the language in which they are couched is so gross that we cannot allude to them more particularly). Now, let the reader (continued Mr. Gregg in conclusion of the extracts)—let the reader calculate, from these specimens, how many priests and friars were guilty of similar abominations. Let no one be angry with me for reading from this list, or pretend that it is a breach of modesty. It will be very useful in its results with the public; and let it be remembered that my reverend friend, in excusing the questions of his brethren in the confessional, said, should not every corner of the house be examined to find out sin? In the same way do I say, should not every corner of their house be examined to find out the villainies which disgrace it. I will now read a story to you from this work, which will probably satisfy my reverend friend as to the merit of the stories which he says I am so fond of relating; and I am sure that the result of the spiritual comforts of the confessional, described in it, cannot fail to amuse you:—A certain lady wished to see a certain Bernardine friar, for whom she sent, pretending that she was very ill. The friar came, and said he should commence by holy shrift. * * * * * In the evening the lady's husband, who was a physician, pulled from under her pillow the pair of br———s, which had been left there since the confusion of the morning, and the lady said that they were the relics of the blessed St. Bernard, which had been brought to her by the friar, and which restored her to perfect health. The news of the miracle spread abroad immediately, and it was honoured by a procession, and the ringing of bells, and the relic being carried in triumph with crosses and holy water, and kissed by all the people, among whom the dolt of a husband was the first. Is not that a good story?—but it is nothing to others which I could bring you from the attested confessions of the monks and abbots of the same period, which are so infamous, that nothing but the truth of Jesus Christ could induce me to seek out to discover them, or bring them before you. Go to foreign countries, and see what has been the result of the confessional; and then look at Protestant England, which is so distinguished above all others for the delicacy of the intercourse which is carried on between the sexes in society. Mr. Maguire abuses England, but he goes to the scum of the country, while I go to his religious houses, to the skin of society. Thus, there is a great deal of difference in the foundation from which we derive our arguments—for while he gropes among the lowest order of society, I go to that quarter where, if there be any perfection in his church, it ought to be found. Having thus finished the subject of marriage, I will now come to that of flesh meat. I go to the root of the matter, for I shall begin at the principles, as I always do. Nothing can be more plain than the meaning of the Scripture, as I have already quoted on this subject. The word employed in the Greek original is Bromata, which often stands for all kinds of food, or the general sustenance of life. Thus bread often has the same signification, meaning all substances used for food, and thus 2 Samuel, chap ix, verse 10, "And thou shalt bring in the fruits, that thy master's son may have food to eat; but Mephibosheth, thy master's son, shall eat bread always at my table," where bread signifies the whole produce of the earth. In the same sense is bread used in St. Matthew, chapter ii, verse 10; and in another place it is said,

" provided he is worthy of his meat— *Trophis autou,*" from all which it is clear that the word employed is used to signify all provisions, *Ta epitiiata tou Somatos,* as it is expressed in St. James. Now, then, having established this much, I shall proceed to show the application of the prophecy to the doctrines and practices of the Romish Church, and thus show that meats in general are forbidden by them. I refer, for that purpose to the rules drawn up by the founders of monasteries for their monks: take those of St. Bennet for the monks of the west, where it is most expressly ordained they shall abstain from every species of flesh meat, *e carnibus quadrupedum omnium.* " No monk hath leave," say those rules, " to eat any flesh meat;" and others, who were not absolutely monks, were not allowed to eat it except on certain prescribed days. This is clearly the meaning of the text of the apostles; but I now come to the *votum paupertatis* of the monks.

Mr. Gregg's half hour then terminated.

Mr. MAGUIRE—You have seen, my friends, how, when I quoted Protestant authors against my opponent, he objected, and said he would hear nothing but the Holy Scriptures.—Now, when I argue out of the Scripture, he runs to his own historians, to writers of his own party—men who have been convicted of ten thousand lies—who were employed by the tyrant, Henry the Eighth, to invent calumnies against the religious establishments which he wanted to destroy. They calumniated the monasteries, to give a colour to the projects of their master, who plundered and abolished them, not for any public advantage, but for his own vile purposes—purposes which the presence of ladies does not allow me to mention (cheers from the friends of Mr. Maguire). I have too great a respect, Mr. Gregg, for those whom you have calumniated to mention any thing improper in their presence. What then did Henry the Eighth do? He got up a commission of plunderers to calumniate the monasteries, and rake up crimes which had been invented by their bitterest enemies. I, on the other hand, produce the authority of Bishop Latimer, who says, that such crimes as followed the introduction of the Reformation had never been known in England before that time. I refer to Dr. Heyland's history of the times of Edward the Sixth, where it is said that such impurity and infamy as were then to be found in England never existed there before; and that it had arrived at such a pitch that it was useless to think of introducing any reformation of manners. Here, then, is the testimony of your own writers as to the state of crime in England subsequent to the Reformation; and Henry the Eighth himself tells us, in a speech made in parliament, when referring to the reformers, that there was no love to be found between them—that they taught and preached against each other with the utmost virulence—that they were so occupied with the *mumpsimus* of the old way, and the *sumpsimus* of the new, that they had no time to think of the Word of God—that the Spirit of God was not amongst them—that they spoke most slanderously andvilely of the priests—the very thing you are doing now, Sir—that the Word of God was handled and disputed in every alehouse—that it was made the subject of songs and jests—that it was distorted contrary to its true meaning—and that those who read it followed not its precepts: in fine, that there never was so wicked and bad a generation known in the country. Sir, I refer you to Stowe, and you may there read the character of the first Reformers. I shall now go to the Scriptures, and show you the true meaning and acceptation of the texts produced by you. I

have proved from the ancient Fathers, and the authority of your own divines, that it was the Ebianities, and the Marcionites, and the Manicheans who were thus foretold by the Apostle as being those who forbid the use of marriage and flesh meat. It is they who said that those things were unclean and unlawful; that there were two principles, the one good and the other bad, and that those things were the invention of the evil principle, that is, of the devil. I have here thirty-two passages from the Holy Fathers, proving that the sanctity of marriage was admitted by the ancient church. You know that it has been made a sacrament by the church—that we have still retained it as a sacrament, while you have rejected it as such; and it is on that account that you are angry with us. It is not true that we forbid marriage to any one, but we contend that, when persons bind themselves by lawful vows, they are bound to keep them. Mark, then, the difference of your interpretation and my interpretation and my interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. In the 7th chapter, First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, he says, "I say, therefore, to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I; but if they cannot contain, let them marry." Here, then, we have the unmarried state mentioned as preferable to the married state, and further on we have the cause assigned: for "He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife." This, then, is the cause, because the married man is solicitous about the things of the world, but the unmarried man is solicitous about the things of the Lord, how he may please God. — Can anything be plainer than this? Does not the apostle first say that the unmarried is preferable to the married state, and then assign the reason for its being so? Now, at the very time when the Church was, according to my reverend friend, in its purity—in its golden purity, I should have said—we have the fathers expressing the same sentiments as St. Paul, and plainly evincing that they understand his language in the same way that I do. It is a most surprising thing to me that he should attempt to prove that we undervalue marriage; if that were the case, would we not preach that the world should be soon at an end? The passages of Scripture which I have quoted do not prove that marriage is unlawful, nor have I ever said it was; but they prove that virginity is preferable to marriage. I have produced nineteen different texts of Scripture to demonstrate the doctrines which I hold, and what reply have you given me? You have brought forward texts which I admit as fully as you can, but the application of which, as you have given it, I regard as false and absurd. Does it not look like an attempt to cheat and humbug the common sense of the meeting, thus to cloak over an argument with texts of Scripture which have no reference whatever to the subject? We shall see, Sir, when the full report of this discussion is published, which of us has been guilty of this fault. When the disciples of John the Baptist asked our Lord why they did not fast, and practice the austerities which were practised by them, did not our Lord reply, that while the bridegroom was with them they fasted not, but that the day would come when the bridegroom would be away from them, and that then they would fast? What does the Scripture mean by that, but that when Christ would not be present in a visible manner in his church his followers would fast and practice mortification? I ask you, do you admit

the fast of Lent? Are you aware that in the first 400 years of the church the use of flesh meat was forbidden on certain days? If you do not admit it, I pledge myself to prove it to the satisfaction of every rational man who hears me. While speaking of the worship of God, and the worship which we pay to saints, you do not appear to be aware that the Greek word *Proskuneo* is applied exclusively to the worship of God; and that the Scripture frequently makes mention of a kind of worship which was paid to other beings. Thus Joseph, it will be admitted, was a figure of Jesus Christ in a most perfect manner, and was known to be such by the Patriarchs. Thus, when he was by the bed side of his father, Jacob, the latter, acknowledging him to be the type of the Messias, is said by the Scripture to have worshipped the top of the rod of Joseph, regarding it as the sceptre of Christ. Will you not admit that when we are told to honour our father and mother, or to honour the King, that we cannot comply without giving them the worship which belongs to God? I tell you that it is a downright absurdity to say it. I say that we never gave to any being, besides God, the honour and the worship which is due to him alone. But you say we are liars, that you know our doctrines better than ourselves, and that we give the worship which is due to God alone to our saints and the images of the saints. What can be more absurd than such an assertion? I will now go to some of the Protestant writers; whom I shall quote on the subject of calling the Pope Anti-Christ. I refer you to Grotius, in his 557th Epistle, writing to John Gerard, one of the early reformers; and I will refer you to what Vossius says on the same subject. Our calling the pope Anti-Christ (said Vossius) is most absurd, but we are obliged to teach it for the good of the Protestant religion, because many people wish to believe it, and persuade themselves of its truth. And in his 570th Epistle, writing to one whom he calls *thick skull*, that is, Sir, to a man who could not be persuaded to any argument, he says, why should we leave off calling the Pope Anti-Christ, for many persons would then go away from us, who wish to persuade themselves that he is Anti-Christ, and there are many enough leaving us already? I have read some extracts to you from Doctor Hammond—I have given you the testimony of that very learned Protestant writer; in his notes he laughs at the idea of the Pope being Anti-Christ, and says that the destruction of Babylon appears to have been fulfilled by the ruin of pagan Rome, and that the church had never been of the opinion, so as to decide that the Pope was Anti-Christ, although some said that they were as sure of it as that Jesus Christ was God; that such, however, might think for themselves, and entertain whatever opinion they wished on the subject. It is absurd to think that the bishops of Rome successively were Anti-Christ, or that any individual Pope was. I have proved to an absolute demonstration that the Popes could not have been Anti-Christ, and I am prepared to repeat my arguments; and, unless you admit their force and justness, I convict you, in the presence of the meeting, of wilful blindness and misconception, and an attempt to mislead the people by vain fancies and the shadows of argument. Observe, that I build the whole of my argument on the prophecy on which you rely, and I shall read it to you. You tell us we are guilty of apostacy; but I know who were the apostates —who were the locusts which are foretold in this book. I could point them out in those who, according to their own admission, received their doctrines from the devil—in Henry VIII., who received his from Anna Boleyn—and, in their followers, who were worthy in their lives of the

principles of those from whom they received their faith. I have shown you that the words "that man of sin," must mean one man of sin. You then said it was "the man of sin." I proved that you were wrong from your own Bible; you referred to the original Greek, and there also I proved that you were wrong. The words there mean *one* man of sin. Again, "for it is the number of *a* man," and of the man or men; and *his* number is 666, that is, the number of one man, and not of a series of many men. Again, our Lord says to the Jews, "if another come in my name, you will believe him," meaning, as all agree, that the Jews will believe in Anti-Christ, but have the Jews ever believed in any Pope, or in any number of Popes? You say that as the weeks of Daniel are to be taken as weeks of years, so are the time, and times, and half a time, that is, the 1260 days, to be taken as 1260 years. I admit in the former case that they must be taken so, for the prophet himself expressly mentions it, but in the latter case we are told that the time was limited. Thus, in the eleventh chapter and third verse, it is said, "and I will give to my two witnesses, and they shall prophecy a thousand two hundred and sixty. days, clothed in sack-cloth;" but you, Sir, say that the reign of Anti-Christ is to last, not for 1260 days, but for that number of years. Where, then, I ask, are the two witnesses who should prophecy in Jerusalem during that time? Where have they appeared prophesying during the 1260 years that you say the reign of Anti-Christ lasted. Further, in verses 7, 11, and 12, "and when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the abyss shall make war against them, and shall overcome them and kill them.....And after three days and a half, the spirit of life from God entered into them. And they stood upon their feet, and great fear fell upon them that saw them.....And they went up into heaven in a cloud, and their enemies saw them." Where did all this come to pass? Where were the two witnesses killed, and then brought to life, and carried up to heaven? If you have a particle of candour or honour, or a sense of justice, you will answer to this assembly the question which I put to you. I call on you to give a distinct and decisive answer to those two texts. You are bound to do it; you owe it to the public to answer them. If the reign of Anti-Christ lasted for 1260 years, the two witnesses were obliged to have been during the whole of that time alive. When were they visibly taken up to heaven? I am surprised that any man should be so blind to common sense as to rail, and roar, and stamp, as you have done about the apostacy of our church, pretending to demonstrate it by a portion of the Scripture, of not one word of which you know the meaning. If the time, and times, and half-a-time, mean 1260 years, I call on you for a division of that period corresponding to the words of the text. Can you point out any such division? You want to make it appear that in sixty years the reign of Anti-Christ will be at an end. On what ground do you support that opinion? Now, Sir, I tell you that unless you answer all those points to my satisfaction, and to the satisfaction of any man of reason and common sense, I will not again go into the question of apostacy with you. Observe, my friends, I call on him for a clear answer. Above all things, I say, let it be clear. If he give such answer I will be obliged to reply; but I wish that you, and the public, should see the difference of our arguments, and be able to select that which will appear most rational to you. For my part, there is nothing difficult—there is no mystery in the arguments which I produce.

Here ended Mr. Maguire's half hour.

Mr. Gregg—Now, I would be willing that the whole discussion should rest on this one thing—this one question put by my rev. friend—if I had not answered it most fully every day since we commenced (cheers from Mr. Gregg's friends, and cries of "no, no," from the friends of Mr. Maguire)? Have I not answered the question of *outos antropos?* Have I not taken up the question of Enoch and Elias, the two witnesses of the Lord, and shown that there were preachers who stood up for the truth of Christ in every age, who resembled them and spoke in their spirit, and might be regarded as their representatives, in the same way that the Pope was the representative of the man of sin?—Have I not given Scripture to show that by the number 1260, 1260 years were to be meant? And now Sir, you tell me that there is no parity between Daniel and the Apocalypse on that point, for that Daniel explained that the weeks were to be understood for years. Now, I would be glad that you would show me where that is said; here are the words of Daniel himself—"Know, therefore, and understand that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah, the Prince, shall be seven weeks and three score and two weeks; the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times; and after three score and two weeks the Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself; and the people of the Prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined; and he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week, and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation; and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate." Not one word in all this about the interpretation of the weeks by years; but I will tell you who gives the interpretation: it is not Daniel, but the commentator employed by those Bishops we find here, with Daniel Murray at the head of them, it is he who explains the text in this note. But, my friends, I will not be diverted from my object by being called on to go over again those grounds which I have traversed well enough already (cheers from Mr. Gregg's friends). I will say one word of the authorities which I have quoted. My friend asks me why I travelled out of the Scriptures, and I answer how could I find the crimes and abominations of the Popish priests and friends in the scriptures? How should I find them if not in historians, to whom I refer for a testimony of facts, and not for their opinions, which I care nothing about! Is not that a fair way to argue? I don't care a fig about the opinion of any man who opposes the opinion of the church; and as for this Dr. Hammond, who appears to be such a favourite with my friend, he seems to entertain a very high opinion of himself. But we Protestants are stubborn fellows, and whenever we find the word of God telling us any thing, we clap our foot on that, and neither Dr. Hammond's nor any other man's, or number of men's authority, can drive us away from the position which we have thus taken. We have it expressly said, in the homily of our church against wilful rebellion, that the Bishop of Rome is Anti-Christ, and that the Babylon of the Revelations is applicable to Rome, the kingdom of Anti-Christ; and in the homily on obedience, it is said that the Pope ought to be called Anti-Christ. We receive the authority of the homilies, and we do not fly to that of Dr. Hammond, or of any other man. I say that such authority is not worth a fig; but my friend has recourse to it for opinions, where it has no weight,

while I only look to it for historical facts, which can be known by no other means. Mr. Maguire tells us something about worshipping a sceptre; if he wishes he may, for all I care, worship any sceptre he pleases, but I say that such is contrary to the spirit of the Holy Scriptures. I shall, however, leave the subject of idolatry for the next question to be treated of, and I hope will bring forward such arguments on it against the Church of Rome as neither ignorance nor obstinacy shall be able to extricate my reverend friend from. In 1 Cor. chap. vii, verse 9, the Apostle says—"I would that all men were even as I myself; but every one hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that." Now I would wish most sincerely that all should perform the work of God with single mindedness; and again the Apostle tells us that the married man has cares, "but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world." I know that well enough; but if the unmarried man have not the gift which is necessary for his situation, I say that he has still greater cares than the married man. I say that unless he has that special gift, he cannot have the single-mindedness of the married man. I have known some worthy and holy men who had not that gift, but they did not grope and feel in subjects about which they could know nothing in the world. The priests tell us they want to keep a watch over female virtue; but I say I would not give much for virtue which would require the guardianship of bachelors (loud hisses, followed by cheers) It is an abominable, an infamous, a ——— system, to which men tamely suffer their wives to become victims (loud hisses, followed by cheers, which prevented us from hearing the remainder of the sentence). I hear some hisses; why, if men wish to let their wives be kept in order in that way, let them do so; but I have the mind of the world with me (at this period, several respectable females rose and left the room, and we understand that many thought it necessary to depart, after hearing some of the statements and expressions made by Mr. Gregg in his first speech). Now I say, that I have most amply and sufficiently answered Mr. Maguire on his arguments brought from the seventh chapter of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, and I will return to it no more. I request that the reporters will take that down, I will not again return to it. Well, at the close of my last speech, I was proceeding to make some observations on the vows of poverty. The rules of the monastic orders required that no monk should possess any thing of his own—even a book, or pen and ink, or a pair of shoes, or anything on earth; and we are told an instance in which a monk having died, 100 solidi or shillings were found in his room, which he had earned by weaving linen; and such was the indignation expressed by the other monks, that they condemned him loudly, and cast the hundred shillings after him into the grave. I begin by principles according to the plan which I have hitherto followed, and I take the case of the young man to whom our Lord said, "go and sell all things whatever thou hast, and then come and follow me." I gave my explanation of this text on another day, and my reverend friend gave his gloss; but I say that my gloss was better than his, that it was the right one, and that you will all prefer it. I say that these words of our Lord do not contain any precept of perfection, but that they were intended simply to lead the young man—who, it appears, was puffed up with ideas of his own excelleece—to lead him, I say, to a knowledge of himself, that he might be made to see the vanity and imperfection of his resolutions. Now mark, my dear Sir, I pray you mark the concession which I make.

I am sure, and I most firmly believe, that were it not for the abominable Romish church, and the practices and doctrines of the Romish priests, there would be an incomparably greater number of examples among Protestants of following this advice of our Lord. The holy faith would purify their hearts, and the rich would despise their wealth, and feel that they had no business with it. But Popery demoralises the world—it corrupts the poor in such a manner, that were the rich to give up all they had for them, it would but make the world a vast Haceldam, where they would be driven into fury by the possession of that which they would have grasped from the wealthy. But if there was a general change of principles—if Popery and its effects were banished from their hearts—then there would be no danger from giving in abundance to the poor, because they would be sufficiently prepared for it. In England, Protestant England, that privileged country, how princely is the liberality of the rich ! They give away with the utmost generosity, and the poor receive with gratitude. I know many holy men, and women, who consider that their goods are not their own, and that they are but the stewards of the Lord. I am astonished, Sir, how you could, at the commencement of your speech, assert that I have not quoted a word of Scripture. You could not have meant to be serious when you made such an assertion. We read in the Acts of the Apostles, chapter iv. verse 33, " For as many as were owners of lands or houses sold them, and brought the price of the things they sold, and laid it down before the feet of the Apostles, and distribution was made to every man according to his need," &c. Now, I say that, were it not for the baneful effects of Popery, such also would be the state of things in the Protestant Church. Look at England ; where there is no poor man—no man is a mendicant. They must have a law to support them, because they insist upon it ; every man stands firm on his right and must have the relief he demands. There is nothing but Popery which corrupts the heart, and prevents the general outpouring of the rich into the hands of the poor. So much, then, for the principle of poverty. I shall now come to the Popish way of practising it. I refer you to the Romish Breviary ; my rev. friend can have no objection to that, let him grapple with it if he can. There, at the 451st page, we find an account of St. Hilarion, who built a little hovel for himself, a *casa*, as it is called, which was so small that it was scarcely the size of his body, and there he lay on the ground, wearing a hair-cloth which he never washed or cleaned, and buried amidst filth and vermin. And in page 435 we are told that Francis, by fasts and want of sleep, and iron chains, reduced his body to a state of extreme thinness. I would be glad that my reverend friend would try that experiment on himself (loud cheering and hissing). I could give you examples of a similar nature, *usque ad nauseam*, but that I would not waste your time, or disgust you by the recital of them. I know that my reverend friend will stand up, by and by, with an *argumentum ad captandum*, on the mortification and austerity of those monkish practices : but I answer that not all the wealth, and pomp and splendour, and luxury of the Bishops of the Church of England could be half so bad as the filth and vermin and nastiness of the Romish monks. I might compare their practices with others equally disgusting, followed by some classes of the Indian priests ; but, for the present, I shall confine myself to the examples of the Romish saints. Here is a new one—one Benedict Joseph Labré—who, according to his life, written by his confessor, James Barnard, president of the English college at Lisbon, chose to place a barrier of disgust between himself

and the rest of mankind. With a face naturally good, he contrived to make himself appear most revolting; he abandoned himself to the bites of disagreeable insects, had his body girt with a cord, and kept his head uncombed. There, my friends, was sanctity in an outward appearance, more disgusting than that of the most miserable beggar that we have ever beheld. In such principles we learn the causes of the beggary of Ireland. No less than one hundred and thirty-six miracles have been recorded after this man, and authenticated by the bull of his beatification. My friends, is it then a wonder that Ireland should be scoffed at, and be a mark for nations to wag their heads at, when her people are instructed by such precepts and examples—when they are taught that by raggedness, and vermin, and filthiness, they are entitled to anything but the merited rebuke of civilized society? Here we have the example of this man sanctioned by pretended miracles, no less than one hundred and thirty-six of which were certified up to the day the book was written, July, 1786. What men those are, to whom you are instructed to direct your prayers and invocations to heaven!

Here Mr. Gregg's half hour ended.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I do not wonder at my reverend friend's ridiculing mortification and fasting: I do not wonder at his being unwilling to give up the pomp and luxuries which his Church allows him to enjoy. Oh, no, that would not do. It would certainly be contrary to the spirit of the New Gospel, and he has a right to object to it; but I find fault with him because he blasphemously tells you that they are contrary to the laws of Jesus. I ask him, did not John the Baptist live upon locusts and honey? Did he not retire from the world to the wilderness, and get food from the trees? And was not that mortification; and did not God approve of his mode of life, and hold him up as an example to the Scribes and Pharisees? Oh, my friends, what a blessed, fine, glorious, example of Gospel liberty is it to humbug John the Baptist, and all the holy fathers who have lived lives of mortification and self-denial, for living as they did! Oh, it is no wonder that the new locusts make a humbug of John the Baptist. Next he talks of the miracles of Benedict Joseph Labré. Now, I challenge him to deny miracles. He has not attempted to deny them yet. I have showed you that Dr. Cave, a writer of your own Church, recounts several of them. I have read them from Eusebius, a celebrated historian. There are not three pages in his works in which you will not meet with the recital of some miracle. It is related by him that Narcissus, who was once a priest, but apostatized and broke his vow, was visited in the night by an angel, and scourged from the top of his head to the sole of his foot, and the next morning he went to the bishop and showed him the marks of the scourging, and begged on his knees to be received again into the Church. You laugh at the story, but if you do, you laugh at Eusebius, and all the ancient historians of the Church, and I leave you to the enjoyment of your scepticism, in which I do not envy you. Why, I have innumerable texts of Scripture in favour of mortification and fasting. St. Paul says—"I chastise my body, and keep it in subjection, lest when I preach to others I myself become reprobate." You translate it "a cast-away," but it does not matter. Now, what is the meaning of that? There are several other passages to the same effect to be met with throughout St. Paul's Epistles; and now, let me ask you, if St. Paul chastised his body, was it wrong for Benedict Joseph Labré to do so? Besides, you know, Sir, that the word

munditias, though it literally signifies cleanliness, yet it is generally used by all writers to signify the luxuries of life. You will observe, also, that the motives of these cannot possibly be known to you. You should not, then, attack them for their acts, when you do not know the springs of those acts. Some may live in the grace of God without punishing themselves; but if others feel that they cannot retain the grace of God, nor live a life of chastity without punishing themselves, then are they justified in doing so; nay, they are bound to do so. You have read, I suppose, of the saint who was so strongly tempted by his passions that he used to roll himself in whitethorns to subdue them; and if that was necessary, he was right. Would you say that it was an ungodly act? You would, for you hold that no man can observe the Commandments; therefore all are free from them. You tell me---following the example of the arch-heretic and founder of your Church, Luther---that the observance of the Commandments is impossible to every one. But I tell you that there are hundreds of ladies and gentlemen in this room who both can and do observe them. I will give you Luther's words in the original German, or in Latin translation by his disciple, where he makes the assertion which I have mentioned. You next talk of fasting. I tell you, Sir, I do not fast to become faint, though I mention that fasting and abstinence are both right and necessary. Now, let me ask you, Sir, is it right to ridicule what our blessed Saviour, the apostles, and all the holy fathers and saints have both preached? You want to force me again into a comparison of Roman Catholic with English morality. I tell you all such comparisons are invidious, and I will not enter into them. But I will tell you one thing. There never was a necessity for the introduction of poor-laws into England until Henry VIII. destroyed the Roman Catholic monasteries and abbeys, where the poor were fed and clothed, and where they received not only spiritual but corporal support; and transferred their property to others, not for the good of the poor, who were originally benefitted by it, but for the purpose of enriching those who backed him in his irreligious actions. I tell you that it was only when the Reformation was introduced to satisfy the lechery of the prince, and when the religious property was given to men who looked to their wives, and their children, and grand-children, and neglected the poor, that Elizabeth was obliged to introduce poor-laws; and I tell you that she would have been shaken from her throne if she had not done so. Look to history, and you will see that there was no poverty in Popery, and that it came in with the coming of Protestantism. You will find that our religion is practical Christianity. We practice what you preach. He tells us that but for the blasted Popish religion his parsons and his bishops would give up their £60,000 and £30,000 a-year, and that the bishop of Derry would give up his ninety thousand green acres, and sell all, and give it to the poor. Now, is not that a very modest assertion? Now, if you believe that, I give you full liberty to believe every word he has said since the commencement of the discussion. But the fact is, he has given us nothing but assertions. He gives us the lying stories of a parcel of infamous writers. He says that the work of Doctor Couissins was never answered. But I say that it was ably answered by Howardine, and torn to pieces by Manning. But why should I imagine that he reads the works of Roman Catholic authors, when I know that he reads only those on one s[illegible] of the question, and that he does not endeavour to eradicate the prejudices which he derives from them? He talks of

bachelors, and mocks them for being so. Why, our Saviour was a bachelor, Paul was a bachelor, Luke was a bachelor, John the Evangelist was a bachelor, and every single one of those who followed our Saviour were continent from the time that they were called. We are told by the fathers that this was the case, and the fathers themselves were unmarried men. But you tell me that the vow of celibacy was abused; and, let me ask you, even if it were, is that a reason for crying out against it? Why, if I were to say Judas betrayed our Saviour, Peter denied him, and all the other Apostles deserted, might I not, as an infidel or a Jew, derive a better argument against Christianity from it than you derive from the abuse of it against celibacy? Would not that be a far better argument in the mouth of Voltaire or of Rousseau against the Christian doctrine than yours is against the celibacy of the clergy? I have quoted Dr. Grier, a Protestant divine, against you on this head. You took no notice of him. I showed that St. Paul and all the Apostles recommended celibacy both by writing and example. I quoted to you the text, "He that giveth his daughter in marriage does well, but he that doth not, does better." Thus, both marriage and celibacy are good, but celibacy is better. Are we to follow the example of the Apostles, or are we not? Is the head to set example to the feet, or the feet to the head? You quoted the text, "Let every bishop be the husband of one wife," and you say I did not answer you. I quoted St, Augustine *de virginitate*—I quoted Gregory, Nazianzan, St. Irenæus, Tertullian, and others, of the fathers to show that the meaning of the text was, that any one who had been married twice could not be a bishop, because it was an evidence that he was too much inclined to worldly indulgence to observe celibacy. It meant, that suppose a man was married, and his wife died, if he married again he could not be consecrated a bishop. And is not that a perfectly correct regulation? Do you not know that if a man had been married twice he could not even become a deacon? Surely the same liberty that is allowed men should not be allowed to clergymen, whether priests or bishops, who are constantly handling the sacraments and using the sacred things connected with the church and the altar. You know also that in the old law, if a certain thing occurred to them the priests could not even enter the temple till they had bathed themselves in the evening. Why? Because the old law was to be the perfect type, in point of purity and holiness, of the glorious sanctity of the new. I shall not say anything of the married clergymen of your church. I know that many of them have very great virtues; but I do say that riches and luxuries are not among the marks of the true Church of Christ. No; the Church of Christ has been always subjected to persecution, and it ever will be persecuted as long as it exists. He then speaks of priests living with their nieces. If a clergyman keeps a house, and who cannot marry, what housekeeper can he better have than the daughter of his brother or his sister? Who could he have living with him that would less excite the suspicions of the evil-minded? It is not that they fear what their flocks would say or think of them—for they live among them, and are known by them, and they fear not for any thing they may imagine. But it is to prevent you and such as you from having unjust suspicions. Our Saviour, when he went to convert the woman of Samaria, would not allow his disciples to be present, lest they should hear him when he told her that she was the wife of nine husbands; I say it is only for fear of the easily

excited suspicions of such men as you that the clergymen of our church live thus with their near relations. I now pass over such slanderous insinuations and attacks, and I come to another of your arguments. I ask you, even suppose there have been the abuses you advance, would it prove any thing whatever against me? We came here to argue the unity, apostolicity, and Catholicity of our respective churches, and he turns the question to their abuses. How did Robespierre and Voltaire in France upset the true religion and spread infidelity, but in the way which he has adopted--namely, by attacking the abuses which have crept into Christianity and holding them up to ridicule and scorn? But though no doubt there have been abuses in our church, I fearlessly tell him that there is no other church in the world in which there are fewer than in it. We do not tell the people that we will shoot them for money—we do not shed the blood of the son of the widow for mammon, and spread disorder through the land for the sake of pelf. You have unblushingly quoted to me an act of parliament, and for what? Why, to prove that we are heretics and apostates. What do I care for an act of parliament, passed by a set of fanatics who upset all order, and overturned everything in the shape of order? I care not for an act of parliament, but for acts of Christ. But yours, as I told you, is a parliament church; it is supported by the state, and linked to it, and it could not stand without it. Ours is independent of the state, and God grant that it may continue so. For I tell you that all connexion between church and state is, if not adultery, at least adulteration. You saw him when he spoke of apostacy. You saw how he wriggled and was shaken; he showed symptons of his descent from the old dragon. When he came to speak of the Thirty-nine Articles, he said he had answered all I had said about them before, and therefore he would not waste time by speaking of them now. I tell you he never did answer what I said, and he never will, and the old dragon himself could not help him to do so. He quoted Daniel, and relied on his own explanation of the prophet, that the "time and time and half a time" mentioned in Revelations meant 1260 years. Daniel says the sacrifice which Christ was to establish would be done away with by Anti-Christ. Tell me what sacrifice is to be done away with? You have none; we have, and it has not been done away with. Christ said—"This is my body, which shall be given up for you; and this is my blood, which shall be shed for you. Do this in commemoration of me." We have done it in commemoration of him, and we will always continue it. Now, Sir, you have quoted Daniel; tell me what sacrifice is to be done away with? Again, has he answered a single word with regard to what I said about the two witnesses mentioned in the Revelations, or about the 1260 days or years as he would have it? Now, mark me, it is said also by Jesus Christ that he will shorten the period of the reign of Anti-Christ on account the elect. "You give me," says my reverend friend, "your false gloss instead of the Scriptures. I say the period is 1260 years." Oh! there's a short period. Oh! Sir, you are not in earnest. I declare before high heaven, and before this meeting, that I do not believe you are in earnest. You have not the appearance of conscience while you speak thus (hisses); conscience appears in the face, and it does not appear in yours (hisses and cheers). Now, will you hear the Holy Scriptures without hissing. Don't make me attack you again, or you may be sorry for it (hisses). I feel honoured by your hissing, for it convinces me I make you feel (hisses and cheers). I now refer you to

Matthew, chapter xviii. verse 17. "And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." Now, I ask you, if the church command us to fast, are we not obliged to obey her? His church tells him to fast, but he puts out his tongue at her, and will not obey her, for what she commands in this respect is but the remains of the superstitions of Popery, and the abominations of Anti-Christ. Luke tells us, "Obey those who rule over you." Again, did not Christ say to his Apostles, "I have many things to tell you which you are not yet able to bear, but when I am gone I will send you the Spirit of Truth, who shall teach you all truth." And it is the Holy Ghost that has taught the church to give us the commands which she has given, and we are therefore obliged to obey her. I refer you now to Hebrews, 13th chap. and 17th verse, where it is said—"Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves." Who have rule over him? He admits that our church was the true church for three or four hundred years after the death of Christ; but during that period she ordained fasting, and therefore he should obey her; besides his own church, as I have said, ordains it. In Joel, 1st chap. 14th verse, you will find it is said—"Sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the elders and all the inhabitants of the land into the house of the Lord your God, and cry unto the Lord." Now, then, if fasting were lawful under the old law, why should it be unlawful under the new? Give me a single text to show it is unlawful, and I will yield. You cannot, for there is no text. I would now refer you to Matthew, chap. ix. v. 38—"Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest." And how were these labourers to be employed? What was to be their work? They were to work even as Aaron and Paul worked, in teaching the people and converting them to the Lord. Here now I refer you to the veto of the Apostles, to show you how the bishops were consecrated. Go to the 13th chapter and third verse,—"And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away;" and again, chap. xiv. verse 23,—"And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed." Now, Sir, are you not ashamed of yourself? There are the Scriptures directly in favour of fasting; fasting was necessary in every ceremony, and yet you condemn it. Now, Sir, besides these texts, the history of the church proves that she had authority, and that authority was recognized. Martial, Apollinarus, Montanus, and other heretics, were all condemned by her, as the councils show. Hence you must acknowledge that her authority existed in earlier ages. Tell me what has put an end to it since,—you cannot. Now go to the 1st Corinthians, chap. ix. verse 27, and 2d Corinthians, chap vi. verse 5, and several other texts which it would be but waste of time to quote. Now, then, I ask you once more, was not the custom of fasting primeval with the Apostles, or was it in the first, the second, the third, or the fourth century that it was introduced? I have Eusebius here to show when, if necessary. Remember also, I beg of you, that it is said, "He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me." There is another thing of which I would remind you. The council of Jerusalem, the first that ever was held in the church, ordained fasting, and ordained it also in the name of the Holy Ghost. You receive that

council, you must therefore admit fasting. Why then do you not practise it? Was it not absolute?

Mr. Gregg.—Now, my Roman Catholic brethren, I call on you, I entreat of you, not to allow yourselves to be led into delusion by my reverend opponent. He has used arguments to prove a thing that I never contended for, having only reprobated the abuses; he talked with so much violence and heat that you must, ere this, be convinced that he has not the Spirit of Jesus—the Spirit of Truth. He brings forward things which I allow, and he calls upon me to admit either that the fast of Lent was an institution of the church, or to prove that it was not so. I allow it: it is to be found in the Book of Common Prayer; and, with respect to the subject of fasting, he quoted a text which he did not understand (a laugh); either that, or he was under a delusion. That he was so I'll prove to your hearts' content. And oh! my brethren, come to Jesus Christ, and be cleansed from your sins! He quotes the saying of our blessed Saviour, "Woe unto Scribes and Pharisees!" Aye, there's the rub! Tremble, my Roman Catholic brethren, tremble for the consequences!—they were the men that fasted—the men who were denounced by our blessed Lord. He next refers to the text which says, "The children of the bridegroom can't fast when he is with them; but, when taken away, then shall they fast in those days." That is the text, gentlemen, which fathoms the depth, the profundity, of the glorious mysteries of our religion. The bridegroom is Christ—we have him present within us, the life of glory; when we lose him, then is the time for mortification and prayer; when the soul is in the midst of agony, because of her iniquities, and when she can scarcely support herself, then is the time for penance. I have known circumstances of this kind under which my soul laboured, that I have been obliged to refrain from many of the comforts of life, which I would otherwise be disposed to take (loud laughter.) This it is which shows me that the Church of Rome is the Church of Anti-Christ—the lady seated on the seven hills—which tells you to fast. I say when the Church of Anti-Christ tells you, my Roman Catholic countrymen, it is a different thing, and it is that agony of soul which I have described that arises from such fasting, it being not in accordance with the Spirit of God. The Scriptures tell us we must have the spirit, and it is in consequence of the foul doctrine taught by Popery that we cast out Christ. Let them torment their bodies as they please, they cannot feel that torture of the soul of which I have been speaking, for it is not that which would satisfy the cravings of an immortal appetite; and, Rev. Mr. Maguire, when you go home this evening, examine whether you have got that peace, which is better than whipping your body with a cat-o'-nine-tails, or quilting a petticoat for the Blessed Virgin Mary (hissing and groaning, which lasted for several minutes). Think of a Popish King quilting a petticoat for the Virgin Mary (hissing continued). Think of a man going to commit sin who rejoices like a bridegroom. Is not that as good as making a petticoat for the Virgin Mary (hissing and groaning, and cries of shame continued, for this abominable blasphemy, which lasted for several minutes)? You may hiss, and cry shame; you do well to cry shame at such an abominable practice. The reverend gentleman quoted the words of our Saviour, "he that despiseth you despiseth me, and he that despiseth me despiseth Him who sent me." I, Sir, belong to the Holy Catholic Church of Ireland (loud laughter), and you

are interlopers, just lately imported from the old harlot of Rome; we have your Catholic archbishops and bishops who deserted her, and sent down the stream of truth to us, pure and undefiled. There is one thing I am delighted at, which marks the inconsistency of the reverend gentleman, this beaten man (laughter). See what it is to beat a Popish priest (hisses.) I can't go into the streets in consequence, without a file of police being with me, like Daniel O'Connell. I say, Roman Catholics, mark his inconsistency and tremble for your religion. He said the other day that neither of us were apostates, and yet he talks of the prophet Daniel, of whom he knows no more than of the Arabic language. It is a principle in his church to take the Scriptures according to the sense in which holy mother church (as he calls her, but which I call an unholy church and a harlot church) interprets them. On that very thing I have him, just as if I had a cord tied round his neck. How could he have the unanimous consent of the church for one thousand years that Martin Luther was wrong, or the opinion of the holy fathers and grand fathers, when they were all dead before he was born? But I'll prove to you that Luther was as the angel which came forth from the bottomless pit; and I ask you was there ever such absurd abominations as these? Who is the Church of Anti-Christ? Who is the apostate? Mark—the great woman is Babylon, who is drunk with the blood of the saints. Yes, the seat of the apostacy is in Rome, and I beseech you—Oh! mark me when I tell you that Christ, my master, tells me to warn you of the consequences which will come upon your souls. He says I did not answer one of the questions he put to me; I'll leave that to the room (groans and cheers). I know the reason he says so. He wants me to go over the same ground again, in order to entangle me in difficulties, but he shall not do so. He said that Voltaire, who desecrated France, is analogous to me, because one of the first arguments he used against Christianity was to deny the miracles of Jesus Christ. If there ever was an example which should make you tremble, this is it. Popery is the mother, and was the instigator of the mighty and bloody French Revolution. She was the cause of all the blood that was spilt, and the curse of God came upon her. Why? Because when Protestantism was making rapid strides in that country, in the reign of Charles IX., the then king, they destroyed numbers of unhappy victims on St. Bartholomew's Day—they drove the pure religion out of France—and hence the confusion which pure Protestant principles, mixed with Popery, brought about, that Voltaire was enabled to deride religion. He laughed at the pretended Popish miracles, and brought about that state of things which scourged that country, and deprived the descendant of that very king, who was the cause of the murder of the Protestants, of his own head, as a punishment inflicted by God for the persecution of his people. Very well, mark that. Bonaparte gained power in France—he was dislodged, and the people suffered ten thousand times more than ever their ancestors had many years before inflicted on the Hugeonots. Bonaparte, as you have seen, was put out—the Bourbons were again placed on the throne—the present King's (formerly the Duke of Orleans) father was the principal person who hurried on the death of Louis XVI.—attend to that. Things went on well for some time with the old Bourbons; but the vengeance of God was not complete—it was coming to a close—the powers of Europe placed them on the throne, but another one hurled him from it, and put the Duke of Orleans in his stead. Look at that

punishment, which was inflicted by the Divine Power on the descendant of him who was the exterminator of Protestantism (a laugh). There, Sir, is your allusion to France for you. He tells me that I talk of abuse and not of principle—what are principles?—they mean beginnings. The word comes from the Latin *principia*. Now, suppose the reverend gentleman took two seeds—they are principles—or two eggs; and suppose they continued to argue that one egg was as good as the other—that the Popish egg was as good as the Protestant egg—these are principles (a laugh). I will make you, reverend Sir, hatch your own eggs, and make your goslings come to perfection (a laugh). Then, Sir, the cockatrice will dislodge the fire-flying serpent, and then it will be discovered the egg was laid by the devil, and the seven-headed monster in Rome (a laugh). I was arguing also against celibacy, and he talks and makes a bluster, as if I did not allow that it was a better thing than if a man had a wife, if it be his calling. But I deny it can be, when he had not that gift. I say, persons taking on themselves to keep a vow, without knowing for what, is an abomination. I shall now read some passages from a book, which speaks of the notorious practice which existed.

Mr. MAGUIRE—As a man of honour, you are bound not to read that in the presence of so many ladies. That subject has been already discussed, and this day has been for another purpose.

Mr. GREGG—Then I'll bow to the decision of the chairman.

Mr. NANGLE and Mr. MACNAMARA then consulted for a short time; after which

MR. NANGLE said—In my opinion Mr. Gregg is perfectly in order, as the subject under discussion is celibacy, and, if it may be judged of by its effects from facts which he is going to state, it is perfectly legitimate for him to do so.

Mr. MACNAMARA—I submit to this meeting whether he is in order, or is he justified by the arrangements which have been entered into to follow this course? It was fixed for last Saturday, and disposed of; and, in my opinion, he is departing from the original rule.

Mr. GREGG—I appeal to you whether Saturday was only set aside to discuss Dens?

Mr. MACNAMARA—Dens was not mentioned; and, Sir, it is my duty, while I sit here, to protect the females who are present from being insulted.

Mr. NANGLE—It rests with the speaker whether he will use improper language or not.

Mr. GREGG—I shall not do so. [The reverend gentleman then read a passage, which related to some abuses said to exist in Spain, sometime or other, and so gross and filthy was the language used that several ladies left the room, notwithstanding which his reverence went on to the end of the chapter.] The common sense (continued the reverend gentleman) of mankind is against you. If a man marry, and has a wife, it is all a delusion to say that he cannot serve his God as well as if he had not. But it is a part of the system of abomination which prevails in the Church of Rome. You seem fond of perfecting the dreams in the Old Testament; but, Sir, it is an unfortunate protection to say that, under certain circumstances, a man may excuse himself. That will not go down with the public; it will pull down your chapels over your heads. "They speak evil of the things they know not, and corrupt themselves." In all these things we can easily perceive that God will punish the abominations of——

Mr. MAGUIRE—That is keeping your word; it is just like you, though—

Mr. Gregg—An attempt has been made to stop my mouth, but what have I to care for? If there was corruption in our church in Latimer's time, Popery is the mother of it. The half hour here ceased.

Mr. Maguire—You will judge, my brethren of all religious denominations, for yourselves, though your feelings may be hurt, and very naturally so—for an insult offered to one's religion is the deepest that can be conceived—but I now beg leave to tell you that I am surprised at the conduct pursued by my friend, Mr. Gregg. Friend I will call him, notwithstanding, for before God, I have not an enemy on earth. What think you of bringing a subject before the ladies here which he knows well, if my hands were not tied up by their presence, I would confound him, and retaliate upon himself and his church one hundred fold? But, Sir, I would rather lose ten thousand arguments than utter one word which would wound the delicacy of these females who are present. Here are some hundreds of Catholic ladies and Catholic gentlemen present, who know well how bare and unfounded are your insinuations—knowing, as they do, from their habit of going, that such abominable calumnies have no foundation. Your church, Sir, admits confession just in-the same way as you do fasting, by theory but not by practice. It states that the penitent must go before the clergyman, in order that he may investigate the state of the penitent at confession. He would do so, but it savours too much of Popery; and although he knows the awful responsibility which we exercise with regard to wives and sisters, and daughters, and mothers, yet he brings this charge forward, imagining that he'll succeed in exciting a feeling of jealousy in the minds of fathers, brothers, and husbands. I tell you, Sir, you labour in vain, and that they are at this moment laughing at you. They know our conduct, they are witnesses of our lives; and I tell you more, not only is any thing which you insinuate forbidden in that sacred tribunal, but the smallest approach to it suspends a clergyman for life, and he is never restored to his office again. That was by a bull of Benedict the 14th, which has exposed us to the villainy of those who may present themselves at confession, bribed, as it is known they have been, in order to found charges against us. And thus we are daily in fear of being attacked by some wretch or other who may have determined to destroy us. In like manner did the Arians bribe a female to go into the house of St. Athanasius, in order to found a charge against him: but that holy man, thinking it was a spirit who was in the room, got alarmed and implored for assistance, which being heard by his servants, they rushed into the room and found the female there, who told the vile purposes for which she was sent. This has been invariably the conduct pursued in every age by heretics in attacking the church of Christ and her ministers. Marcion said he was inspired also, like you, Mr. Gregg, when he addressed the venerable Polycarp, who was one hundred years old, as related by Eusebius—"Acknowledgest thou me?" asked Marcion. "Yes," replied the venerable Polycarp, "I do; thou art the first-born of the devil." So that you see, my friend, you are not the first heretic who attacked the ministers of Christ; and so that, you see, we have got your pedigree in a line like so many dragons' tails. I'll ask you this question, Sir, "What right had St. Polycarp to give Marcion that name, unless he himself belonged to the church of Jesus Christ, which could not err? You admitted yesterday that Marcion was a heretic, and that you belonged to the holy and apostolic church of Christ. Now, Sir, that cannot be, for you and I disagree. You call the Pope Anti-Christ, and I look upon him as

the vicar of Christ on earth. I belong to that faith which St. Polycarp professed; consequently, you must have been a heretic as well as Marcion. Our apostolic bishop is the successor of the man who sat in Peter's chair: and do you recollect that when Napoleon put Pius VII. into prison the people of the Church of England released him? That is, they released Anti-Christ, and they gloried in being able to grant liberty to this same Anti-Christ. You receive our baptism, our consecration, and, more than that, you have not got any thing which you can call your own, save some of your Thirty-nine Articles. And what a religion is yours, and what a Fusbos you are for defending it. You see, gentlemen, he had no other way of getting out of it but by saying that some of our bishops apostatized, and went over to him. Did they, dear Mr. Gregg, bring any thing new with them? They brought you your baptism and holy orders, and that was enough for you.

Mr. GREGG—They did more.

Mr. MAGUIRE—Pray will you name what they did.

Mr. GREGG—They renounced the errors and abominations of Popery.

Mr. MAGUIRE—Indeed! O, no!—but they embraced the new tenets of the Reformers by taking to themselves wives. But, Sir, you did not ordain them, for your ordination is derived from us—they remained the same as they were before, even with the marks of the beast upon them. He then talks of Voltaire, and of France, and gives you a long dissertation about Protestantism and St. Bartholomew, and Charles IX. Now, why did I quote Voltaire? To show that the very weapons which he has used against me in this discussion were those used by Voltaire, by Rousseau, and by others, against Christianity. I did not talk of Charles IX., or that Charles X. lost his throne because his ancestor massacred some Protestants. To be sure he committed some slight errors in history, but they are nothing, as I am only here to teach him theology. But, Sir, is it not well known that before the massacre of St. Bartholomew took place, 1,700 Roman Catholics were cruelly butchered, and that that act was perpetrated by way of retaliation? I am sorry that he has introduced such topics, because they tend to create feelings of irritation, and to lead to consequences which is the bounden duty of all, if possible, to prevent. He again talks of celibacy. Oh! that is a painful subject just now—seeing my hands are tied down; but no matter, nothing shall fall from me calculated to wound the delicacy of any one present, no matter what may be the consequence. The reverend gentleman said yesterday that Henry the Eighth's offence was, that he had set at nought a Popish distinction, which would not allow him to marry Anna Boleyn; the question is, was it lawful to marry his brother's wife when, *ratem sed non consummatem?* She was only fifteen years of age when the marriage took place, and then in a very sickly state. He never lived with his wife, and you say that marriage was not valid. There is a man in Trinity College who did the same.

A voice from the crowd—Shame.

Mr. MAGUIRE—It is not a shame. I did not mention the name of the individual, and only allude to it for the purpose of showing that you do the same in your church. And mind, Sir, Henry VIII. never objected to it until he saw Anna Boleyn; but that was enough, according to your code of morals, for we all know Martin Luther allowed ten wives to one man.

A voice in the crowd—No, no.

Mr. MAGUIRE—You say no, no. Is it not a fact known to every one that he allowed Phillip, of Landgrave, the number I have mentioned? There are men, Sir, whose testimony is nothing, because they distort facts, which I would prove, but this is not the time for doing so. Christ instituted the sacred tribunal of confession—"Whose sins you forgive they are forgiven them, and whose sins you retain they are retained." How can the powers given to bind or loose be exercised unless the crimes are made known—unless, indeed, you throw pearls to swine, and give the holy sacrament to him whose sins are not forgiven? Are we to give pearls to dogs? The patient communicates his sins to the spiritual physician, just as the patient does his disorder to the doctor, in order that he might prescribe the proper medicine. That is the manner in which persons act in going to the holy confession, notwithstanding the foul calumnies which have been cast upon that sacred institution. He talked of Louis Philippe. I shall not say any thing of that individual, because he is not here to defend himself. The reverend gentleman talks to me about hatching my own eggs. That observation relates, also, to another gentleman—a man whose great and mighty talents, Sir, outweigh yours and mine put together, and who, notwithstanding the malignant efforts made to sever us, have always lived on the most intimate terms of peace and good will. But he has been caught in a trap. I will not say more now, as I do not believe he is in the room; and if he were it would be unworthy of me to do so, as he would be deprived of the opportunity of defending himself. If I must hatch my own eggs, they are those of the Church of Christ, who have professed his doctrines for 1800 years, and did not spring from the infernal locusts from hell, Luther and Calvin. I will now give you a specimen of your holy fathers, who have been taught in the school of the devil; but first I must give you a reference to where you shall find what I'll read for you—I have the book here in the German, and you can have it if you wish. In the 7th Tome of Luther, the Wirtemberg edition, page 458, and in the Jena edition, page 480, the confessions of honest Luther, which I am going to read for you, were translated into Latin at his own desire, by his disciple, Justin Jonas. He acknowledges, in the first instance, that made him, or at least convinced him by five reasons, that the holy and unbloody sacrifice should be discontinued, and that he should say mass no more. Thus, gentlemen, you see the great and eternal God has been pleased to leave a memorial behind of the wickedness of this demon and madman; if that were not done, it could not be said that he followed the advice of the devil, in order, that at the day of judgment, you and those who are wilfully and judicially blindlike, may not have any excuse when called upon to answer for your misdeeds. You said, Sir, that I did not know the man, that I was mistaken, and that as soon as I should discover my errors, I would retract what I have said; but, Sir, I know him too well—indeed, a little better than you do. "My gospel (he says) will be preached and acknowledged by the world in two years; it will overturn bishops, priests, monks, nuns, altars, bells, books, candles, the mass, and will not leave a remnant of Popery in the world." There was a prophet for you! You follow this great man, Mr. Gregg, and hear next what he says,—"God has decreed from all eternity that a certain portion of mankind should be damned." There's blasphemous impiety for you, attributing sin to the great and eternal God. He again says, that the whole entire body and blood of Christ is comprised in one species alone

and he adds, "Let no man upbraid me with this argument, for Jesus Christ's body can't be without a soul." "I know," he continues, "that the Decalogue and its laws were given to the Jews, and not intended for Pagans or Christians," And again, "Let us abstain from sin, and above all from good works, for it is impossible to resist the temptations to sin, and the Scripture says we are the slaves of the devil. It is impossible for me to tell a man how he can live chastely, but this I know, that it is impossible to do so. For my own part, I must obey the necessities of nature." There, Mr. Gregg, how do you like that? It is easy to know you, for you have all the cant and appearance of the early reformers, of the hypocritical humbugging locusts who deluged the earth; and, on God's account, will you for once see the error of your ways? Luther continues—"I do not speak of John Huss as a heretic, indeed, I believe truly, I doubt whether I speak the truth or not, but I believe that mankind will give up Pope and Popery, and fall down before me, and say I was their Lord." Can that, Sir, be the religion of God or Jesus Christ, or of his holy Apostles, which would be taught by a blasphemer such as this? Is it possible that a religion which did not make its appearance for 1500 years, and which left Jesus Christ childless during that time, could be of divine institution? I have challenged him to show that the Thirty-nine Articles were the work of the Holy Ghost, and the answer he gives, is, that it is not to the number we are to look, but to the meaning. Let him produce the form of faith—the Liturgy—the name of any one church that ever adopted them. O, no; he can't answer that, for there never was a church of any kind that ever did so, unless it was invisible. You have nothing that you did not take from us. Why? Because Luther declared before God and man, that, not even in his days of apostacy, there was nothing preached as pure as that religion which had existed for one thousand years. The homilies of the Church of England declared that this Church did exist eight hundred years or more. You see they added more to it in order that it should not, if possible, appear older or younger than that which Luther had established; so that our Lord having established a Church, it remained invisible for one thousand years, and no one looked after it. Did you ever hear of the General Councils, the four first of which you believe in? There was the first General Council at Nice, held in the year 325; that of Ephesus in 451. The first of Constantinople; the second of Constantinople, 553; the third, where the Pope presided, held in 680. The second Council of Nice, held 787, which condemned image-breakers; the fourth Council of Constance; the first of Lateran held in 1122, a council which was held to free the holy law from the dominion of the Turks, and——

Here the half hour ceased.

It being then two o'clock, the assembly separated quietly.

EIGHTH DAY.

WEDNESDAY, June 6th, 1838.

The sensation created by this extraordinary controversy remained still unabated, and, notwithstanding the great length of time during which it

had continued, when the hour for its being resumed, yesterday, approached, the people flocked in crowds to the Rotunda, with apparently as intense interest as they felt from the very beginning. The champions of the contending churches entered the arena at the usual hour. When eleven o'clock arrived,

Mr. Gregg rose and said, I call on Mr. Maguire to proceed with the discussion.

Mr. Maguire—My friends, previous to commencing the great work of this day, which is my day of attack, I shall make some observations which shall be few and pertinent, upon the gross and scandalous matter contained in the last half hour's speech of my reverend opponent yesterday, and upon the grossness and malice generally with which he has thought proper to attack monks, nuns, friars, priests, and religious houses; and in doing so I shall refer him to his own Protestant historians, to show him that more base, false, and calumnious charges were never made in the world than those made against the Catholics and religious houses about the time of the Reformation. (Here the reverend gentleman read extracts from various Protestant authorities to show the falsehood of those accusations.) He then proceeded—I wonder the reverend gentleman did not bring forward Maria Monk ; but her lies and slanders are too recent —there are living witnesses to prove their falsehood, and it would not suit his purpose to quote her as an authority. In a couple of centuries hence it may answer in the hands of some assailant of the Church of Christ, but at present it would not do, although it is equally as true and quite as disgusting as the authorities which he has quoted. The whole foundation for all the abominable slanders with which the Rev. Mr Gregg has so long occupied the time of this meeting rests upon a vile pamphlet, entitled " Henry Stephens's Wonders of the World."—There is his authority for you, gentlemen !—" Stephens's Wonders of the World !" and wonderful enough are the stories contained in it, but not one of them is true. In Burnet's History some of those falsehoods are set out; but he does not tell you upon what authority he gives them ; and Fuller, who wrote upon the subject, tells you that Burnet himself did not believe them, although he put them into his history. He laid aside truth, and justice, and charity, which he should have strictly observed, with regard to the memories of men who were gone to their account ; and Battersby, in commenting upon this history, and examining the grounds upon which it was given, says they are wholly unworthy of credit. There is no foundation for them ; the writer gives no authority ; and hereupon let us lay aside all such stories about religious houses, priests, nuns, &c. I can read you, Sir, a host of respectable Protestant writers, and other competent witnesses, all acknowledging that there is neither truth nor charity in those extracts which Mr. Gregg has thought proper to read. Again, Thorndyke, in speaking of them, refers to the passage in Timothy where the apostle says, that heed should not be given to fables and genealogies without end, which minister questions rather than the edification of God, which is in faith. Such, my friends, is the authority upon which my opponent has brought forward his charge against the Catholic Church. Next, my friends, I will say a word about the question of apostacy, and then have done with it for ever ; and mark me well, my friends, in this part of my case. Mr. Gregg says that my church is the Church of Anti-Christ, and he makes the acknowledgment then that either his church or mine must be the apostacy ; and I have given such irrefragable proofs, that

he was overwhelmed and stood in confusion. He was not able to show the time when my church apostatized; but I showed him that it was impossible she could ever apostatize, unless Christ had broken his promise to her. I shall again refer him to Scripture. In Matthew it is said, that when our Saviour was sitting on Mount Olivet the disciples came to him privately, and said to him, "When shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming and the consummation of the world?" And Jesus, answering, said to them, "Take heed that no man seduce you, and many will come in my name, saying I am the Christ, and they will seduce many." And our Saviour adds, "That his church is the pillar and the ground of truth, and that he shall be with it all days, even to the consummation of the world." The church was not seduced—she could not be seduced—she was the city on the mount; but many of her members were seduced and went out of her. Luther, and Calvin, and the whole spawn of locusts were seduced—they were seduced by their own foul and ungovernable passions, and they went out—they apostatized—the church cast them off, and they founded a new religion, and preached new doctrines. So much for the apostacy. The Saviour says, "I will be with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." At the consummation of the world shall come the time of Anti-Christ. There is my demonstration, and I am done with the subject for ever. I now come to the subject of the day. I must say that I have frequently argued, since this discussion began, that Protestantism was without principles, and that no Protestant, according to the articles of his church, could make an act of faith, and that it was totally out of the power of a Protestant to prove that he had a true copy of the Scriptures, or that there was a true copy of it in the world. I ask you now again, Mr. Gregg, how do you know, or how will you prove to me, that the Bible is not falsely translated—whether your translations be honest or not—whether it has not been falsely and maliciously interpolated by the wretched hands of the monks and priests with whom it was for so many ages, and to whom the world is indebted for the preservation of the Scriptures? (Here the reverend gentleman read Dr. Grier's answer to Dr. Milner upon the canonicity of the Scriptures.) He then continued—How now, Sir, will you show me by your church, or by any authority upon earth, that the Scriptures are the genuine Word of God, and that they have been preserved in all their original integrity?—Dr. Milner asked him to prove the Scriptures, and he answered, as Mr. Gregg will answer, and as every Protestant is bound to answer—let the Scriptures prove themselves. Prove the Scriptures by the Scriptures. Now, I tell you, Sir, that the Scriptures do not prove their own inspiration. There is not a single passage throughout the whole Bible which says that all the Scriptures are inspired. How then, Sir, will you prove them if you do not trace up their safe keeping through the church to the very hands of the Apostles? But I will show the malice, and roguery, and villany of the first Protestants who attempted a translation of the Bible. I will show you the base and wilful perversions which they have made in the word of God. Here, to wit, the celebrated text about the Holy Trinity, where it is said that there are three who bear witness in heaven. Upon this passage the Unitarian argues against the divinity of Christ; and how, Sir, will you meet the Unitarian, and argue with him upon this text when you say you have no proof of the canonicity or integrity of the Scriptures but your own assertion? There was more roguery, villany, and malice exercised

in the translation of your Protestant Bible than ever was known in the whole world; and the higher you go up the more fraud you will find to have been practised—the more you will observe the retrograde motion—the more, Sir, will Protestants be astonished at the work of those impious hands which have perpetrated such blasphemous outrages upon the scriptures of God. These men say they give you the Gospels; they recommend them to your perusal; they are to be read by all the world; whilst at the same time they have filled them with fraudulent and wilful errors, wholly opposed to the letter and the spirit of God's holy word. My Protestant friends, I would not wish to wound your feelings; and I am sure I will not do so by bringing before you the fraud and blasphemy with which the apostles of your church have dealt with the Bible. But I implore and beseech of you to reflect upon those daring perversions of the Word of God—to open your eyes to the truth, and, having heard and seen those facts, to judge for yourselves. When the first translation of the Protestant Bible took place the errors were so glaring and so palpable, that they alarmed the first Reformers; and in another translation which followed, some of those errors were corrected. There have been upwards of eight thousand corrections in the Protestant Bible from the time that it was first published up to the present time, and there are twenty-nine corrections yet to be made. Mind, my friends, I do not talk of errors arising from the construction of language, or the difficulty of certain texts; but I talk of wilful and gross perversions of the Word of God by these early Reformers, for their own purpose. (Here the rev. gentleman read the names of some of the translators of the Protestant Bible, amongst which were Luther, Calvin, Coverdale, Beza, Zuinglius, Walton, &c., and then read extracts from the works of each, all condemning each other's edition of the Bible, and pronouncing it hellish and blasphemous.) Calvin said that Luther's translation was the work of the devil. —Luther condemns Calvin, Calvin Beza, Beza Zuinglius, Zuinglius Coverdale, Coverdale all the others, but each and all maintaining that his own was the correct version, or that it was, as Luther said, what was best suited for the purposes of the Reformation. Every man was then, as some of our fanatics now pretend to be, wise in the Scriptures; so that Walton, the celebrated and learned author of the Polyglot, remarked that it was once said by Aristarchus that there could not be seven wise men found in Greece, but that it might then be said that there could not be seven fools found, for that all pretended to have a perfect knowledge of the Scripture, which, above all things else in the world, was most difficult to be understood. Here, Sir, I produce your own writers, who acknowledge that it would have been better that the Scriptures were never published, with the errors and gross perversions which the Reformers were guilty of in the translation of the Bible. (Here the rev. gentleman read from Whittaker and others.) Now, my friends, I come to some of the frauds of Luther. He acknowledged that the word "alone" was not to be found in the text of St. Paul, but he introduced it, and had it so in the Bible; and when spoken to and told that it would do his cause harm—that it would give a handle to the Papists to attack his doctrines—he said, no matter about the Papists, they won't understand it, for Papist and ass are synonymous. This infamous attempt of Luther to pervert the word of God is to be found in the 5th tome of his works. Hear what Zuinglius says of Luther. I will read it for you, my Protestant friends. Zuinglius was one of the founders of your church as well as

Luther. Hear, my friends, what he says,—" Luther was a foul and wilful corrupter of the Word of God. He has so perverted the Scriptures that we are much ashamed of him for corrupting the Word of God in such a manner." This will be found in his book *De Sacerdotibus*, tom. 2. On the other hand, Luther condemned the translations of Zuinglius, and I will give you an extract of what he says upon that subject. There was a printer at Amsterdam, named Proclius, who brought a copy of Zuinglius's Bible to Luther for his examination, and he told him to take it back to his master, Zuinglius, and tell him that he had wilfully mistranslated the holy Scriptures, and that it was most false and corrupt, and merited nothing but to be cast into the fire. He was there paying him in his own coin. Another of the Reformers, Beza, in speaking of Calvin's translation, describes it after this fashion:—" Calvin makes the text to jump up and down, not only grossly perverting it, but adding to it wherever it suits his purpose." He then goes on to point out various places where these additions and perversions were made. (Here the reverend gentleman read further extracts from the comments of the early reformers and translators of the Bible, where all accused each other of the grossest perversion and corruption of the text.) He then proceeded. —But what apology do you think has Luther given for adding to the text, that is, introducing a word that was not to be found in St. Paul at all? " Why," said he, "am not I an apostle as well as St. Paul, and if he wrote the whole text, have not I a right to add one word at least, or for that matter, as many words as I like?" There was Luther for you. But do you think any one believed him that he was just as good as St. Paul? No, my friends. Now I have here Parker's edition of the Bible, where he quotes the sixth commandment; but I will not mention what is expressed in it in the presence of ladies; and I trust that since I began this discussion, notwithstanding all the provocation I received from my opponent, that I have not made use of any language calculated to offend decency. I shall pass this over, and point your attention to a few of the glaring errors and perversions which those men have introduced into the Bible. Here they are in the editions printed in the years 1566, 1567, 1577, 1579; and mark me, all these differ from the present translation, and every translation coming nearer to that which is approved of, and sanctioned by the Catholic Church. Here, then, in the first place, is " ye" substituted for " we." The apostle says, " we shall take those who are fit for the church;" but the Protestant Bible has it, " ye shall take those," &c.—meaning that the pastors of the church were to be chosen by the people and not by the church—that the people were to choose their own preachers and pastors, and take all out of the hands of the church. There is Luther for you! Again, in Matthew, where the Saviour of mankind says to Peter, " Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," the Protestant Bible has, " Upon this congregation I will build my church." Now, who ever pretended to say that such a word as congregation is to be found in the text or context from which this is taken? The words are plainly and palpably " Upon this rock," and the Protestant Bible of the present day has it so. See, then, the wilful and corrupt perversions of those apostles of a church which Mr. Gregg would maintain is the true Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. Ah, Mr. Gregg, those were the apostates, and your church is the apostacy. Again, instead of " He that will not hear the Church," they have it, " He who does not hear the con-

gregation ;" thus turning rock and church into the word congregation alternately. This again is corrected in the present Protestant Bible, for they would be ashamed that such glaring perversions should now go before the world. Again, where it is said "my dove is alone," they have it "my dove is one." In the passage about the Eucharist, where it says that "Jesus took bread and blessed it," &c., they have it "Jesus took bread, and gave thanks." Oh, Protestants, will you, I implore of you, open your eyes to the fraudulent and wilful perversion of the word of the most High God by those who were the founders of your religion, or, as Mr. Gregg has it, the Reformers of the old religion? The rev. gentleman quoted various other texts to show the wilful perversion of them by the Protestant translators, and concluded by saying, I may be told that these have been corrected ; but that is nothing to the point which I want to establish. I want to show you that the founders of your church practised gross and wilful frauds upon God's holy word—that they were the apostates who went out from the truth—who were cast out from the true faith : and I ask you what confidence can you have in your Bible, coming through such roguish and polluted hands?—Half hour ended.

Mr. Gregg then proceeded, as follows—You heard Mr. Maguire talk of Dr. Grier and Dr. Milner, and say that Dr. Grier could not answer his question about the Scriptures proving themselves. Now, I ask you, what has this discussion to say to that, or what have we to say to Dr. Grier or his opinions of the church? If Dr. Grier spoke nonsense, that is nothing to us ; and I make no doubt there would be Protestants in plenty found who would speak ridiculous enough. But, Sir, when you, find that I or any other Protestant form our faith to the opinions of Dr. Grier, or any other doctor who chooses to talk nonsense, or contrary to the letter and spirit of the Scriptures, then you may boast of a triumph in quoting them as authority? Would the reverend gentleman think it fair, if I found some strange concessions in Dr. Milner, that I should quote them against his church? No, my friends ; I would do no such thing. I go to his church for my authorities to show her spirit and her practices, and I go to the Scriptures to show that that spirit and those practises are opposed to God's word. That is the way in which I go to work ; that is the way in which I proceed ; whilst, on the contrary, my opponent is wasting his strength, and frittering away his time in quoting authorities against me for what I, nor any human being, probably, care not one pin. He should not waste his valuable strength in acting in this way ; he is assailing the Church of England, and I promise him he has a tough job on his hands, and that all his strength, and much more beside, will be wanted to shake her in the slightest degree. He says that I stand up as the champion for Protestantism *in globo,* but I stand up for the Church of England and her glorious religion. He quotes Luther against Calvin, and Zuinglius against Beza ; and he shows strife and contentions, and quarrellings, among the early reformers, about which we don't care a straw. I put it to you, if I showed perversions of the Scriptures by the Greek church, and quarrelling and dissensions amongst the first founders of it, would you deem it fair that I should quote them against you? No ; but if I did so, you would have Mr. Maguire glad to see me at such a job ; he would be glad to see me running away from the point at issue, and I must admit that I am glad to see him at such a job. He has got a certain task in his hands, and why does he not stick to it, and not take up another? Now, if I gave a man a pair of

shoes to make, and that instead of them he made a pair of breeches, would you not think him a stupid fellow? But, Sir, keep to the question. You cannot retreat from the fleecing that I will give you. You talked of errors in the Protestant translation of the Bible; but see, my friends, what the whole turned out to be; no more than this —that there were errors, and that we corrected them; that is something. He stated, that the further you go into Protestantism, the more perceptible was the retrograde motion; and that there was nothing but fraud and rapacity at the head of it. No doubt the farther you go up to the head of Protestantism the nearer you come to the tail of Popery. Those who were the first Protestants came out of Popery, and it might fairly be expected that they should bring along with them much of its darkness and its vices. You call them apostates, but they came out from you on account of your crimes and abominations. You are the apostates, and I verily believe in my soul that every Roman Catholic in these kingdoms, particularly every priest, is a rank apostate. My friends, I speak to you in affection; but I am bound to speak the truth. If I find a man in a fever or an ague I am bound to represent to him the true state of his condition, and, although he may rise up in anger against me, I am nevertheless bound to tell him the truth; and if I tell the truth, don't count me an enemy. I ask Mr. Maguire does he understand this text of Scripture—"Whosoever shall fall on the stone shall be broken, but he on whom the stone shall fall shall be ground to powder." Will you tell me, Sir, the meaning of that? but before I tell you the meaning, I shall tell you a story. Dean Swift, at one time, who was a wit in his way, was told that a tailor who wished to separate from the church wanted to speak to him. Very well, said the dean, show him in. The tailor was introduced to his presence, and he told him that he wished to separate from his church, and gave him various reasons for doing so. "Well," said the dean, "you are a surprising man. Have you ever read the Apocalypse?" "I have," said the tailor. "Well," said the dean, "do you remember having read there of an angel who stood with one foot on the land and the other on the sea?" "I do," said the tailor. "Well," said the dean, "would you be able to tell me how much cloth it would take to make a pair of breeches for that angel?" There is a question for you; answer it if you can, and then I will answer your cavils against religion. It is in this way that Mr. Maguire puts his questions, and declares that he will proceed no further until they are answered. But I put questions founded on the Scripture to Mr. Maguire; but I hardly could expect he would answer them. If I wanted to be instructed in the Scriptures, it is not to the Romish Church I would go for instruction. But if I wanted to be instructed about holy-water, and beads, and clay, and such things, I might go there. I will come now to an explanation of this passage. "The man who stumbles in his walk is the man who sins, and the man who sins is he who falls against the rock. The just man may sin and rise again, but not without being broken and suffering for that sin. But the man who shall go out from the truth of Christ Jesus, is he upon whom the rock shall fall and grind him to powder." I tell him this text in Daniel has reference to Popery. You have apostatized and gone out from the faith, and I tell you when the storm of Jesus Christ thunders against Popery, then it is that those who are members of the apostacy shall repent in vain—and my prayer to God is that the Rev. Mr. Maguire, and

those who think with him, may repent in time. I would put my hands under your feet to save your souls. It is not by single texts of Scripture that we are to discover the word of God—no attempt of the apostacy can corrupt the text—and what have errors in the translation, with regard to certain passages, to do do with the letter or the spirit of the Scriptures? If the text of John, to which the Rev. Mr. Maguire alludes, were out of the Bible, it would make no value whatever, and if it were out, the doctrines of the Trinity would still be the same. He talks of errors which are no more than verbal, but it is not a verbal consideration of the Scriptures which leads us to a knowledge of them. I really did not know what the reverend gentleman was to be at to-day. I did not know that he was to have attacked the Protestant translation of the Scripture, and I am prepared with documents to show that the Catholic translations have been most foul and abominable, and monstrously corrupted. To-morrow I shall be prepared, and I shall make the hair of your head stand on end. I will show you when they introduced holy water, saint and image worship, with all their utter abominations, into the Scripture. I know some of my friends whom I see opposite, will assist me in procuring these translations (here the reverend speaker looked over anxiously towards where the Rev. Mr. Nolan, late Catholic priest, was seated). He talks of errors in our Bible—but look at our version, and you will see various words printed in italics, which shows that there is no corresponding term for them in the original; and so it was with Luther when he made a translation of the Bible—he believed in his soul that if he brought the sense with him, mere verbal alterations did not signify. There is an old proverb, and though I don't pay much regard to proverbs, I believe them when they speak the truth—*haud desit quod subintelligitur.* I don't want to say that you have not cause to cavil with those things; but they have nothing to do with doctrine. Did you see my friend, when he came to the sixth commandment, what delicacy he evinced; he would not read it because the ladies were present. Oh! "the spotless pure Maguire," as the ballad says. But although he was too delicate to read the commandment for you, he did not tell you that his church left out the second commandment in the Catechism—which second commandment says, "thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing that is in heaven above or in the earth beneath, or of those things that are under the earth—thou shalt not adore them, nor serve them, for I am the Lord thy God, mighty, jealous, visiting the iniquities of the fathers unto the fourth generations of them that hate me, and showing mercy unto thousands to them that love me, and keep my commandments." He did not tell you that his church mutilated the terrible commandments of God, and left this out of the Catechism from which youth are instructed. That omission is the reason that he has as the sixth what we have as the seventh commandment; he would not read for you that commandment; but I ask him, did not God's justice flash before him as a sword when he read—"Those who take away from the prophecies of this book, their names shall be taken out of the book of life?" Although this would seem to relate directly to the prophecy of the Apocalypse, it relates also to all the Scriptures. But Mr. Maguire, by showing errors in our translation which have nothing to do with our doctrines, is endeavouring to turn the question into an infidel question, by casting doubts on the Bible. The question he seems to raise, is—is the Bible the book of God? instead of meeting the arguments which I raise against the monstrous corruptions and crimes of his

church. He tells me we can't prove the Bible, because we separated from the dregs and corruptions of the Romish Church, and flung off the husks. Will he tell me that the gold and silver brought by the Israelites out of Egypt was all hay and stubble, or that it was not pure because it came out of that land of crime and corruption? We have our apostolic bishops and our clergy—we have had our faithful witnesses, who kept the faith alive for ages; and I believe that it has been, by some fortuitous circumstance, by the special interference of God, who blinded the eyes of the Roman Catholics and the Friars, that the Bible was preserved to us. I come now to your *liber expurgatorious*, for I like to be running into your rat-holes after Popery. I will show something out of this. [Here the reverend gentleman commenced reading a chapter on celibacy, when his half hour ended.]

Mr. Maguire—Be pleased, my Protestant fellow-countrymen, to observe that the question I proposed to Mr. Gregg was this—namely, was there any principle in the Protestant religion which could satisfy the Pagan, the Jew, or the modern Infidel, that the Scriptures, as contained in the Bible, were the genuine word of God? Observe, I entreat of you, that was the question. If he does not answer that question, I say that I prove most clearly, and with the most perfect demonstration, that there is no such principle in his religion. My Protestant friends, can he so humbug you—can he throw dust in your eyes, so as to make you believe that he has answered this question? Have you not seen how he has endeavoured to evade it? He tells you that we dare not corrupt the Scripture, lest the judgment of the living God should fall upon us for doing so. I produced the authority of a Protestant divine, Dr. Grier, high in his church,—a man celebrated for his learning and his talents—a man of high authority in Trinity College, and who enjoys a benefice in his church; I have produced his authority to show that his church had no principle to prove the authenticity of the Scripture, and that when that question was pushed they were obliged to have recourse to the Scripture itself for the answer; and I have shown that that was insufficient; and yet that same Protestant divine who makes that assertion enjoys a benefice in your church. Sir, he drinks of your best blood, and nestles in your bosom, with that admission on his lips! Why, you say a great deal about our *Index Expurgatorious*, but it would be well for your church if she had an *Index Expurgatorious* to expunge those assertions of her children which are so much at variance with her doctrines, and prevent them from running about in every imagination of their own, so detrimental to the true faith of Christ. But she dare not do it. She is a dumb dog on the walls of Jerusalem, and dare not frighten away the enemies who flock around her. She knows that they but follow their own rights, according to the example which she sets them. She cannot get rid of them, but must suffer them to drink her heart's blood, and nestle in her bosom still. You asked me what would I have to reply, if you quoted passages from Dr. Milner against me? I defy you, Sir, to quote any word of Dr. Milner's against me; he never wrote or uttered a sentence against the received opinions of his church, as you say Dr. Grier and your most eminent and learned divines have done against those of their church. If he had, Sir, we would have cast him off, as we cast off all who ever did so—as we cast off you and your church. I defy you, then, to quote Dr. Milner, or any other Roman Catholic divine, against the propositions which I come forward to establish. Well, this is my

day for attack; but you want to get me on the defence, by coming forward with your attacks instead of answering my arguments; and when I assail your principles, you endeavour to get out of it by saying that you are not prepared to answer my arguments to-day, but that you will do so to-morrow. Now, whenever I was attacked, have I said that I was not prepared to answer you? Do you think, Protestant gentlemen, that I am thus to be thrown off my balance? I shall not thus be put out of the order of my argument. When, in alluding to some of the Protestant translations of the Bible, I objected to reading a passage which was corrupted in it, you blamed me, Sir; but although I am not as pure and as perfect as you say, yet, Sir, I am a man of delicacy, and would not put the feelings of the audience to the blush. You threaten us with bringing proofs of our mistranslating the Scripture. I ask you did I attack the translations of your church for any trivial or inconsiderable mistake, but for wilful, gross, and abominable perversions of the sense of the holy writ? When I mentioned the feuds, and broils, and contradictions, and crimes, and perversions of the founders of the Protestant Church—of Luther, and Calvin, and Zuinglius, and Beza, &c., you ask me what I would say in reply if you retorted on me the doctrines and opinions of the Greek Church? Why, if you did, I would say that you very much resembled a certain animal with long ears. Do I attack you for the doctrines of any church or sect which has been thrown overboard by your church? And who were those men whom I have mentioned—Latimer, and Ridley, and the others of the first reformed bishops, who were your great forefathers and the founders of your church? Do you say that we have no more connexion with them than we have with the Greek Church? You say that the head of your church was very near the tail of Popery, and was contaminated by the contact. Now, I ask you, did not those men who composed the head of your church, and who were so very near the tail of Popery, as you say, I ask you, did they not bring with them out of Popery a great deal of roguery, and blasphemy, and indecency, and if that was not the true cause of their leaving Popery, or rather of their being cast out of it? I am sorry to be compelled to come to that subject, and I hope that my Protestant friends will not be angry with me. I told you, Sir, that you had nothing in your church worth having which you did not get by begging and stealing from us—your ordination, and baptism, and prayers, and festivals, &c.; but you say you had them from the bishops who went over to you from us. Yes, Sir, these were the apostate bishops; but I do not say that it was the apostacy of Anti-Christ, which I hold has not yet arrived, but the apostacy of the locusts which is mentioned by St. John. What, my friends, must you think of the man who, after saying that it was owing to God's providence that his word was preserved pure through the ages of apostacy, adds, in the very next words, "or to some fortuitous circumstance?" What! the word of God preserved to the world by some fortuitous circumstance! the Bible preserved to the world by mere chance! Merciful God, what a theologian I have to deal with! what patience I require, to argue with a man who has no principles to go by. My Protestant friends, you have here a fine specimen of the champion of your religion, of the champion of Trinity College, too. What doctrines you hear from his mouth! How does he argue? I call on him to produce the proofs that his church is the Church of Christ, and he refers me to the Scriptures, where he says it shines out so gloriously that no man can be deceived.

If the truth shines out so brilliantly and clearly from the Scripture, how does it happen that the Arians of old could not see it, or the thousands of heretics who sprung up at different times? or how could the millions of every age, and every country, who, you say, were plunged in error, how could they have been so miserably blinded as to have mistaken the light which so gloriously shone upon them? Observe, I do not call upon you to prove the Holy Trinity for me; you know that I most firmly believe it; but I call on you to tell me how you would prove it to the Arians, or to the Unitarians. Where, I say, have you principles on which you could prove the Holy Trinity to them? Now, I say that you have inflicted, in this discussion, the greatest blow on your church which she ever received from the hands of the greatest of her enemies. You now say that the public judgment of the church is the ground on which you are to receive the Scripture, whereas before it was the authority or inspiration of the Holy Ghost on which you were to receive it. Why, this should be called a heresy, and you ought to be brought to an account by your church for broaching it. I asked him how he could reconcile the inspirations of the Holy Ghost, when they were conflicting, as he must acknowledge them to have been, if his principles be true; but he would not answer my question; and whenever I ask any thing from him, in the way of proof, he rambles from one subject to another, and evades the point in question. But, although this is my day for attack, you observe that I also find time to reply to his arguments. I say that he must either prove the Bible to be the integral and genuine Word of God, or he must throw the whole authority of the Scriptures overboard; and how does he meet this difficulty? Simply by telling me that he is not bound to answer me. When I cast up to him the crimes and contradictions of the first Reformers, the great fathers of his church, he says that he has no more to do with them—that he has no more to do with the grand Reformation than I have to do with the Greek Church? Why, is it possible that he will throw the grand Reformation overboard, as we have cast off the Greek Church, or any schism or heresy which occurred since the foundation of Christianity? I say, my friends, that the Protestant religion never had a really dangerous enemy until it fell into the hands of the Rev. Mr. Gregg. He talks about our perversion of the Ten Commandments. Was there ever such a miserable attempt to pass over a half-hour, for the want of any thing else to say? He made such a route and noise about it, and then, after spending a full quarter of an hour on the perversion, he concludes by saying—what? That we have it all right in our Bible, because we were afraid that the judgment of God would fall upon us if we corrupted it! Well, then, we have the Ten Commandments right in our Bible.

Mr. Gregg—But in your Catechism they are not.

Mr. Maguire—Oh! we have omitted part of them in our Catechism! Why, there are ten thousand texts of the Scripture, besides, omitted in our Catechism. He does not blame us for omitting the words ox and ass, &c., in the third commandment, and we do not omit the second, for it is, as we believe, contained in the first. We only give the heads of the commandments in a little halfpenny catechism; we give what we consider to be the sense; and let me ask you, Sir, how do you know any thing about the division of the commandments? Moses never made any division of them, and from what authority have you received that which you adopt? I prove that our division of them is the plain and rational one, and that

which is evidently pointed out by the Word of God, and you, having divided the first into two commandments, merely for the purpose of attacking us on the subject of images, you are obliged, in order to retain the number, to join the 9th and 10th into one, and put the wife along with the ass and other property; while we, more rationally, distinguish them, as they ought to be, and make the ninth refer to the wife as that which is most dear and important, while the tenth refers to the other property of a man. It is thus then that I retort on you. You join both those commandments into one, for the purpose of upholding the abominable doctrine that there is no distinction of sins, and that it is as bad to steal a pin as to break the ninth, or, as you will have it, the tenth commandment. Such, then, is the doctrine of the Reformation; and it is no wonder that such results as we have handed down to us in the conduct of the first Reformers should have flown from it. [Here the Rev. Mr. Maguire quoted some extracts from Protestant historians, in which Beza and others of the Reformers were accused of very gross crimes, the part of the extract designating the crimes having been read in Latin.] I now come to the observations made by my rev. friend on my remarks on the translation of the Bible in the first ages of the Protestant Church. I did not accuse Luther of a simple mistranslation, but of a gross and wilful interpolation, an insertion of a word into the text, and not merely a putting it in the margin, or adding it as a note. But my rev. friend says that there was no harm at all in that, but that they might add as many words as they pleased, provided that they considered that to be the meaning. Why, if we did it, he would tell us all that we would deserve to be damned, and that the judgment of God would fall upon us for having added to the words of that book. But all that Luther said, when accused of having thus corrupted the Bible, was that he was only sorry that he had not added more—that he as well as St. Paul was an apostle, and that if St. Paul had written the whole text, why should he not be at liberty to add one word to it? The rewas a glorious defender and reformer of the faith! My friends, I would not have used those expressions were I not driven to it; but, I must say, God help poor Protestontism, for it never was so badly off as it is at this moment. My rev. friend quotes Daniel to you, and says that I did not say a word about the clay; but I thought that I had quite cleared my stable of the clay. Now, I stake my credit on this, namely, that if I did not answer his arguments on this point, I will be content to pass for not having answered one of all his arguments. But this discussion will be published to the world; and to the public I appeal for judgment in the question between us. Believe me the devil is aware of what is going on here, and will triumph in the injuries which may be inflicted on Christianity in general! Believe me there is at this moment jubilee in hell; but when those who may now be led astray by your statements and your gloss shall be corrected, when all shall appear clear to their view—there will then be jubilee in Heaven. You related a story about Dean Swift that had nothing whatever to do with the question before us, and was perfectly inapplicable; but, for the want of something to say, you will be wasting away your time with stories. Remember what the Apostle says of old mens' fables: they shall be a mark of the locusts. You may amuse old ladies with those stories, but I think you will not, for the future, have so many to amuse. They will ask you, did you get your Bible by a miracle? for if you got it from those rascally Papists they will turn you out. Believe me you will not have so many houses to visit with

your Bible as you used to have. Now, I pray you don't endeavour to get rid of my argument by saying that you smell an Atheist. I have declared again and again, from this spot, that I admitted every word of the Holy Scripture, and that I would lay down my life rather than give up the smallest part of it; but I say you have no principle in your church which could enable you to prove the Bible to an unbeliever. I call on you to answer me, in the presence of those gentlemen, where you got your principles, unless you received them from us; and if so, if you have all that you possess of Christianity from us, why do you turn upon us, and stigmatize our church as an apostacy? I say that, if you have not failed in proving that apostacy, you have failed in nothing. I stake the whole issue of this discussion on that point. How do you get out of the difficulty? The public will understand you, and if you do not meet my question by a clear and decisive answer, they will know why you have evaded my call. I will now return, during the few minutes which remain, to the vile and infamous corruptions in the earlier translations of the Protestant Bible. Here in all the old Bibles, we have in the text, where our Lord blessed the bread and wine, the word *drawn* instead of *mingled*, which is corrected in the present translation; and *killed the beast* for *immolated sacrifice;* bread *and* wine instead of bread *or* wine; those who serve the *temple* shall be made partakers of the *temple,* instead of those who serve the *altar* shall be made partakers of the *sacrifice;* and in innumerable places the word *altar* is substituted for *temple,* and, *vice versa,* so that altar may be taken in an odious sense; and again, the word *elders* is everywhere substituted for *priests,* and also substituted for the apostles. (Mr. Maguire continued to point out several similar examples until his half hour was ended.)

Rev. Mr. Gregg—Now, Sir, to begin with your last proposition first, for I have not taken it down. You talk about our using the word "elder" for "priest." Now, I ask you, and answer the people if you can, is not the word in the Greek *presbuteroi*, and does not that signify elder? *Presbus presbuteros, presbutatos*—is not that the comparison of it? Now, does not that signify elders? And even if we do use the word, is it not perfectly and strictly correct? And is not our English, "priest," derived from "elder?" He says we exclude the word "altar" from the Scriptures. Why, here we have in the Revelations—"On the horns of the golden altar." [He mentioned several other passages in which the word is to be met.] Yet he pretends that we leave it out, just as if we would be afraid of it. No, Sir, it is you who are afraid of retaining the true and original words in the Bible. Let me show the tendency and character of the Popish Bible. The entire spirit that pervades it is evidently an attempt at mystery and mystification. You retain hard words, which cannot possibly be understood. Now, mark me. Why do you call the book of Chronicles *Paraleipœmena?* Now, what is the use of adopting such a word? Does any Irishman who hears it understand its meaning? No; and that is what you want. We use the proper, easy, intelligible name. Why do you use the other? Because you seek to put the brand of mystery upon every thing connected with the Bible, and to persuade the people that it cannot be understood. Why do you call the book the "Apocalypse" instead of the "Revelations?" Why do you not translate the phrase? For the very same reason—to keep the people in the dark. Why do you use the word "holocaust" instead of "whole burnt offering?" Why

retain several other unintelligible phrases which we translate? That the people may think that the Bible is beyond their comprehension, that it is a mystery, and that therefore they may not desire to read it. Well may you shake and tremble. You ask me to prove the canonicity of the Scriptures. Why, I could prove them to any Jew, Pagan, or Infidel, in the world. I ask you, who are they that convert the Pagans? Look, Sir, at the Church of England missionaries, even at the present day, labouring for the conversion of the Pagans in Asia and in the islands of the Indian Ocean. They go abroad from their friends and their country to redeem from darkness those who have never heard of, and who do not believe in the true God and the doctrines of revealed religion. The missionaries in Asia alone have translated the Bible into sixty different languages. We have translated the Bible into Irish for the benefit of our poor countrymen. Can you show any such work as that done by the clergymen of your religion? He asks me to prove the canonicity of the Scriptures. Now, Sir, I will give you but one proof, and that proof you must be contented with, for I will give you no other. It is, that the church is the witness and keeper of Holy Writ; and it is on her authority that we receive the Scriptures. She tells us that the Scriptures, as she gives them to us, are those that she received from the Apostles, and we receive them as such. Now, I could give you other proofs, but I will not. I will not give them to you, but I will give them to those people for their satisfaction—but to you I won't. We have the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, and its authority I give to you, and you must be satisfied with it, for I will give you no other. But, my friends, the canonicity of the Scriptures can be proved in various ways. First, look to ancient history, and you will find that the very canon of the Scripture was agreed to just as we have received it by the primitive church, before it was defiled by superstition and absurdity—before bones and nails were blessed, and devils driven out of sand and mortar. We can refer to the apostolical bishops of our church—a long line of sacred men, without whose knowledge the Scriptures could not have been foisted upon the world, and all of whom tell us that the canon was as it still continues to be. We can refer to a long line of writers and historians (entirely irrespective of the bishops), that touched one another and preserved the connexion, so that there could be no lapsed interval, and rendered it equally impossible that any false Scriptures could have been foisted upon the world. Secondly, and it is by far of the greatest importance, the Holy Spirit has been given to us, and when we read the Holy Bible we are enabled to know that it is the word of God, and we are enabled to understand that word. I tell you, Sir, that the Scriptures contain in themselves such evidence of their canonicity, that if a savage could once compass the reading of them, he would, without the interference of any human being, be fully convinced of their inspiration, and be persuaded of their truth. Thus do I prove the canonicity of the Scriptures. Further, I am asked how could I convert a Jew, a Pagan, or an Infidel? I will tell you, and how I convince them of the truth of the Scriptures. I stand up before them, and I preach to them in the language of God the holy truths which he has taught us. I picture to them the state of their own hearts as depicted in them. I hold out to them the promises of our Divine Saviour. I hold up to them Jesus as he died on the cross for their salvation. I tell them of the happiness which will be theirs, and of the destitute, naked

condition in which they are, and as I preach, the Holy Spirit being a witness, enters into their hearts, and by its divine inspiration brings home to them the truths which I speak, and persuades them to embrace them. This is the way, that by simply preaching and holding up Jesus to the unbelieving, and, by impressing upon them his greatness and his mercy, we change them, not into pillar worshippers, or men who dress up their idols in petticoats, and call them the Virgin Mary, but into true Christians. Thus, we teach them to bow before the altar of Jesus, and to raise up their souls to him in confidence, that, as he has purchased for them everlasting salvation by shedding his blood upon the cross, he will give them that peace which the world can neither give nor take away, and which he knoweth not of that relies on aught but his Saviour for redemption. You ask me, Sir, how can an ignorant Protestant make an act of faith, when he is not able to read the Bible? I will tell you how. We preach to him the Word of God from that Bible. We impress upon him strongly the truths which it contains, and by the blessing and inspiration of the Holy Ghost our words come home to his mind, and he knows almost as much about the Scriptures as if he had read every word of them. The uneducated man then feels, Sir, with far greater force than you can feel (for he belongs to the Church of God), that he is a sinner, and that of himself he can do nothing; and he looks to his Saviour upon the cross, convinced that through him alone he can be saved. Thus, Sir, without reading one single syllable from the Bible, the ignorant man is taught by the Lord, and enabled to comprehend what it contains; and thus, Sir, I answer your question. But let me give you facts which are always better than assertions. I will bring you to England, and I will show you there poor men who have never read a single syllable from the Scriptures, who will kneel before the altar of God, and pour forth their soul in prayer with such a power of divine eloquence, such faith, and in such correct Scriptural language, that I have said when I have heard them thus raising their voices in praise and thanksgiving to the Most High, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, as it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be world without end—Amen." So that, my good Sir, the man who has never, and in all probability never will, read the Word of God, could teach you true theology. And, as I have said, when they do address themselves to God their prayers are entirely and beautifully made up of the language of Scripture. Why, Sir, I tell you I could give you the very names and residences of many and many a poor man in England who, though circumstanced as you have supposed, have every word of the sacred Scriptures engraven on their hearts, and whose prayers are so dignified, whose language, when addressing God, is so refined and so eloquent, that it would shame the aristocracy of any Popish country, and put them to the blush because of their inferiority. And why is this? Because they are taught by God, and are not connected with Anti-Christ. Oh, Sir, let me tell you that if you go into Protestant England, you will there see men truly holy and given to God. You will there see ardent and truly Christian faith, and a beautiful example of the effects produced by religion, pure and undefiled by superstitious abominations. I will now pass from this topic, and I will come to your next point. I will now come to your veiled prophets of a luxuriant religion. Oh, he does not say a word more of them; but we have him turning and twining and saying every thing over and over and over again.

He cannot say one word in contradiction of what I have advanced. He cannot say a single word in defence of his apostate church, and therefore he is only kicking against the pricks, and knocking his head against the rock of ages, which I tell him will knock out not only his brains, but the brains of all those who will continue in your church when they have heard the warning of its approaching dissolution. "But then," says the Rev. Mr. Maguire, "the apostate bishops of our church are the primitive apostles of yours." What, Sir, is it because they leave your church they are apostate? I will tell you this is not the case; but I say that your church is apostate; aye, and that every one who does not leave your church is apostate. So far from any priest or bishop being apostate for leaving your church and embracing our religion, I tell you those who did not are the real and only apostates. You belong, Sir, to the apostate church, and you have not attempted to refute my arguments, proving that such is the case. I say again, Sir, (and tremble when I say it) that you are, and that it is only when you will cease to belong to the Roman Catholic Church, that you will cease to have the brand of Anti-Christ upon your forehead. You tax me with Henry VIII., and the priests and bishops who then left your church. Why, Sir, they are leaving your church in numbers up to this very day. There is Mr. Crotty, with his whole flock—what do you say to him? There's Mr. Nolan (tremendous hisses and cheers); and I could, if I liked, enumerate many others, who in my own time renounced the errors of Popery, and embraced the truths of the Church of England. Why, sir, young as I am in the church, I myself have been the means of restoring men to the true church, and inducing them to come out of Babylon. I have had many spiritual children who, under my care, have renounced Popery and come over to our church; and all this, remember, at a time when the church is persecuted, when the hand of man is raised against her, when her ministers are reduced to poverty, and are refused that which is allowed to them by the laws of the land. I tell you, Sir, that they will continue to leave you, till you are left nearly alone, to be blown up with Rome, the city of abominations. He tells me not to say I smell an Athiest or an infidel, or to use any other expression of that kind. Oh, no, that is coming too close to him. Instead of going on with the argument, he wants me to compare swords. He does not go on with the battle, but stops to measure blades; but I will thrust my blade right through him. And then he tells me I throw Protestantism overboard. I do not. I deny it. If he has any thing to say to Protestantism, let him go to Dr. Urwick—I'll engage he has something to say for himself. If he has any thing to say with regard to Presbyterianism, let him go to Dr. Steward or Dr. Cooke—I'll engage they will answer him. But I have nothing to do with them. I insist, Sir, upon your being consistent, as I am; I will not let you wander. I will keep you to the point.—Bring forward the veiled prophets of a luxuriating establishment. Oh, no, you will say nothing about them, and I must follow you in all you say. But when I have disposed of you, you may be sure I will attack you. Yes, I will, and I will not waste my time in answering frivolous objections. He says I introduce a new rule of faith. I say I do not. But I care not for private witnesses to the faith. I hold the faith which the church holds. She is the keeper of the Holy Word, and I obey her, and receive the doctrines which she inculcates. You ask me to reconcile private and public judgment. I say they are easily recon

ciled. For if the private judgment be well regulated, it will defer to the public judgment, and in the end will invariably coincide with it. He ridicules the idea of a private and a public judgment. Now, I ask, is there not a private and a public judgment in the mathematical world, and does not a well-regulated private judgment always coincide with the public judgment? and if any one imagines that he has discovered some new principle, which is completely opposed to the common sense of the entire mathematical world, and if he will not yield, is he not laughed at and scouted by them? I am, I say, for the right of private judgment, but then that private judgment must defer to the public judgment of the church. He talks next of the division of the commandments; and, oh, I pitied him when he came to speak on the subject. You saw how he winced. Oh, that is a sore point, I know; and when he calls to mind her blessing of stones and bones, her worship of idols, and her consecrating of tabernacles, and all the collecting of pence, and shillings, and pounds, from the poor people, and the degradation to which they are reduced by these superstitious ceremonies, I do not wonder at his shaking, and perspiring. Now, let me ask, how has he divided the commandments himself? Oh, what a mare's nest he has found! It is like the man, who, when walking through the streets saw a stable, open, and came back to his friends and told them he had found a mare's nest. That is just the way with the reverend gentleman. Now, let me ask him, what have we left out of the Commandments? He has left out part of them, and, besides, he has boldly divided them. He knows that the seventh commandment in our church includes the ninth commandment in his. He knows that the commandment, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife," is included in the seventh commandment; and how, then, will he get out of the charge of making them synonymous? You say you care not for the number of the commandments. If you do not, and if you be anxious as to their division, you should reduce them to nine. But, Sir, your church is a false and lying church. Again, he says that they turned out their bishops when they became apostate, and we took them to ourselves without again ordaining them; but that they always ordain anew those who go over from us to them. If so, is it not marvellous that in the reign of Mary, those bishops who had left them and returned again, were not consecrated anew? But let me tell you, they turned your church as I turn you now. I tell you, Sir, that you are guilty of idolatry, and the proofs of it are plain (question, question). It is the question. I am not wandering from it. You charge me with saying that we owe our Scriptures to fortuitous circumstances. I did; but by that you are not to understand chance. I hold that there is no such thing as chance in the world. So much am I opposed to the doctrine of chance, that in my first letter with regard to this discussion, the words I used are, "It came to pass." But when I used the words, "fortuitous circumstances," I had the authority of Scripture for doing so; for in the Scriptures it is used to signify Providence, and I used it to-day in the same signification. He says I am the champion of Trinity College. Now, I'll tell you what I am—I am the little David that will overcome the boasted champion of apostacy. I am a man with no power, no skill, no reputation to lose, and my only qualification is, that the Spirit of God is with me. But poor as I am in those respects, I will stand up against him, and I will show him that, though I am but little, he has caught a Tartar. Come, now, I challenge you, Sir, to come to common sense, and to give up such cavils

as you are using. Now, hear me—I say the doctrine of the intercession of the saints is damnable. Defend it if you can. He calls me "Defender of the Faith," and says I am a pretty defender. Why, Sir, you have given me nothing to defend myself against. On the contrary, I will prove that you are guilty of idolatry, and that your church teaches none but false doctrine. But here I am now without any thing to answer. Why, I protest I might have sat down a full quarter of an hour ago. The man is beaten. He is a beaten man.

Mr. Maguire.—Well, you certainly made out the half hour as well as you could, and I perfectly agree with you that you would have done yourself and your cause much more service if you had sat down a quarter of an hour ago.—Now, Mr. Gregg, in the face of this assembly, I challenge you to-morrow to meet me on the intercession of the saints. I accept your call, Sir (great cheering).

Mr. Gregg.—And I'll meet it (cheering from Mr. Gregg's friends).

Mr. Maguire.—Don't make such a noise; you know the chairman will allow me any time that I may lose by your interruption. You have all heard the proofs which he has given of the canonicity of the Scriptures—First, he says he has them on the authority of his church; but then, what church he will not define, because he knows well she has no such authority. He then runs to the primitive fathers! The primitive fathers of what church? of ours—to prove Protestantism and Christianity. Now, Sir, I ask you is not that admitting the very authority which you have denied all through—namely, that of the tradition of the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church? You have nothing else to prove your own Scriptures but the authority of the holy fathers. Of what church were they? Who canonized them? In whose communion did they live and die before Protestantism was ever heard of? Oh, Sir, you know well it was the Holy Roman Catholic Church. You talk, then, of corruption and apostacy, and yet you are driven to prove the divinity of your Bible to this apostacy and corruption. Your friends ought to congratulate you on going back again to Popery. You deny your apostacy, and when you were put to the proof did we not see that you were obliged to admit you took the whole Bible from us? And, oh, look at him—there is the man who defends Protestantism. What a pretty champion! What an accomplished divine! He goes to ancient history—to profane history. Good God! was ever such a thing heard of? Who ever knew that in order to prove sacred history it was necessary to have recourse to that which is profane? Would not common sense condemn the man who would have recourse to profane history in order to prove the sacred history of the eternal Word of God? What? find out that which is an infallible medium of God's Revelation to man by means of profane history? Is it not monstrous? Is it not blasphemous to prove the existence of the Holy Spirit of God by such means—as if any of the books of Cicero—or Tertullian, or any other writer were to prove the existence of Divine Revelation? You acknowledge you derive a portion of your authority for believing the Scriptures from profane history.

Mr. Gregg.—No, no.

Mr. Maguire.—Ah, Sir, it is recorded against you; the gentlemen who attend here for that purpose have taken it down, and the world will judge of your tergiversation. Again, he says, all this will not do—you must go to the holy Scriptures themselves, in order to prove themselves—that's the book that will tell you every thing. Has Daddy Cooke the

holy Scriptures? Eh, Doctor? Has Dr. Urwick the holy Scriptures? They all differ from you, you know, and despise the authority of your church. O no, no one has them but Mr. Gregg. Why? Because no one pretends to be inspired but him. Indeed he is the only man I ever knew laying claim to individual inspiration. If he be inspired, all I can say is that he is a happy man; but I am very far indeed from being inclined to give him credit for it. The first man who ever laid claim to this particular inspiration was Marcion, of whom I spoke yesterday, and I'll make a present of him to Mr. Gregg. "Acknowledgest thou me?" said this inspired man, addressing Saint Polycarp. "Acknowledge you!" replied the saint. "O, yes, I acknowledge thee to be the first born of the devil" (laughter). There is your inspired men! He says every Protestant can make an act of faith. Upon what? What will the ignorant Protestant do who can't read, if the Bible be the sole rule of faith? Oh, but he says the church is the first rule of faith, and the holy Scriptures are the second, and then the third is so much of Popery as we can find no objection to. Where is the church? He calls that public judgment; and then the holy Scriptures themselves are the private judgment. Which of them are right? If they differ, who is to decide? We can prove that the church to which I belong existed seventy years before the Gospel was written at all; and you are obliged, in order to prove your Bible is the Word of God, to go back to that church. If she were in error, you cannot prove the canonicity of your Bible. If she were not, why did you abandon her? Is that showing who the apostate church is? Where was your church for 800 years after the death of Christ? We have eighteen general councils, which condemned in every age, from the time of St. Peter, every heresy which appeared, down to the Council of Trent, which condemned your own, and excommunicated those who dare to propogate it. Yes, Sir, all these prove to any unprejudiced mind, that the Holy Roman Catholic Church is, and has been, the Church of God throughout the world for a period of 1,800 years. If your church cannot prove the Holy Scriptures, the Holy Scriptures must be less than the church. You must always prove the lesser by the greater; and because you cannot prove your Scriptures by your church, therefore the Scriptures must be less than the church. You talked a great deal about consecrating oil, and blessing holy water. Now, Sir, did I not prove to you, from the Holy Scriptures, that it was lawful? did I not cite three passages out of the Old and three out of the New Testament for that purpose? and did you dare to answer one of them? Do you not know "that every creature of God is good when sanctified by the Word of God, and by prayer?" "All things were made by him, and without him was made nothing; therefore, every thing which he made was blessed." But it is your heresy—your complete ignorance that condemns it. Do you not do so yourselves? Let every one who hears me go to the approaching coronation, and he will find the same thing practised. Do you not bless your churches and your church-yards? I told you, therefore, that there was no principle in Protestantism, and that Protestantism was Church-of-Englandism. He says that *presbuteros* signifies elder? Who ever denied that? But ought not ecclesiastical terms to be used, so as that the proper meaning of a word may be rightly understood? Every elder may be a priest, but a priest may not be an elder; and why then call things by names which are not applicable? Elder is applied to the oldest man, who may not be a priest, and will you then dare tell me that that is a correct or proper

translation? Again, *episcopas* may signify an overseer, as well as a bishop; but will you tell me, in the common acceptation of words, that though a bishop is an overseer, an overseer can be a bishop? This is the way you mystify and corrupt the holy word of God. You ask the reason why we call the Book of Chronicles *Paraleipœmenon*? Did I not convict your Bible of omitting the names of Italy and Africa, and the Islands "far west," in the Prophet Daniel, when he talked of "a continual sacrifice" being offered to the living God in those countries? You omitted that, because sacrifice is too Popish a term, and because it includes England, Ireland, and Scotland, and Italy. You are afraid that the passage which describes sacrifices offering to the Lord by the hands of priests would tell against Protestantism, who have or offer up no sacrifice. You said, also, that in converting a Pagan you would hold out to him the Holy Book; and, in saying so, you gave one of those holy looks to show the Spirit was in you. No, said you, I will not tell Mr. Maguire—not, I, indeed—but I'll tell you, my friends; and, turning round to them, you added "will not that satisfy you?" Then, with a sort of rapture, you exclaim "I'll hold out Jesus." Ah, Sir, this cant will not do. Holy names ought not to be pronounced in this way. Saint Paul tells us "that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bend;" and let me tell you, that that sacred name ought not to be so often on your lips, for there is very little connection between you and it. He then says, I'd show him the Spirit, and I'd preach to him the holy word of God. Now, Sir, the first question the Pagan would ask you is, "How can you prove to me that that is the word of God." "Oh," say you, "he should take it for granted—don't ask me to prove the Bible, and then I'll convert the Pagan." There is a pretty logican for you! Did you ever read Lock's logic, Mr. Gregg? Indeed, if you did, you are not so expert a logician as he was. If you will judge of the Scriptures by the Scriptures themselves, how will you know how much of it is the right Bible, which contains the eternal word of God? Look at it in the hands of Anabaptists, Moravians, Jumpers, Seekers, Calvinists, Methodists—all differing from each other, and professing they have the genuine word of God. Look at the conduct of the celebrated James Nailor. Do you not know that people actually went mad by reading the Bible, not filled by the Spirit of God, but the baseness and villanies of man, when it became an instrument of the devil, to drive mankind into confusion? Look what has occurred in Canterbury the other day, where a man told the people he was the Saviour of the world—that he would rise again in three days, and that nothing could molest him. There's Bible-reading England for you!—where you can get sacks of them for nothing. This man persuaded his deluded followers to resist the Queen's forces, under the persuasion that he would do what Anti Christ will be allowed, namely—to work miracles; and that they would not be touched by a bullet. Look at the miserable consequences which resulted from that unfortunate fanaticism: numbers of unfortunate men shot dead, and others wounded, the wretched man who deluded the poor people, having sacrificed his life. Look at Johanna Southcote: how many props of Protestantism did she seduce?—about sixty or seventy parsons were continually dangling after her tail, as if she were their Saviour. Did she seduce a priest? or would she were she now living? There's your apostacy for you! What care you for apostacy? Be the sect Anabaptist, Quaker, Jew—any thing, even the devil himself, and he is safe, provided he is not a Papist. You

say nothing against the Unitarian, who denies the divinity of Jesus Christ. You say nothing against the Deist—and I regret there are too many of them, No, Sir, but Popery is opposed, because, like the children of Israel in Egypt, it cannot be put down. If you could sink Ireland into the Atlantic for forty-eight hours you would be satisfied. That is the alpha and omega of your orisons, and this it is which shows the holy spirit of which you are possessed, and that love of your neighbour which characterizes you. Oh, we would sell all we have, and give it to the poor, only for Popery. Stick to that, and you will continue in the spirit of error, which, from my heart, I beg of God to remove from you. The rev-gentleman says he defers his judgment to that of the church, and then he admits the right of private judgment to every individual in that church. I will leave you to judge of the consequences which must arise from that doctrine. I shall not give myself much more trouble on that head. You will recollect whether he ever explained, if a disagreement should arise, what was to be done. I now ask him, and I hope he will remember it for to-morrow, whether the Holy Ghost is the public judgment or the private judgment? Which is the rule of faith? and, if either should come into collission, who is to decide? or who is right, or who is wrong? If the public judgment of the church should set up one opinion, I want to know would Daddy Cooke, or Dr. Urwick, or Mr. Pope, bend to that opinion? O, no, they would laugh at you. They have already refused your best benefices, and despise your mandates. Would the Unitarian bow to your authority? Would the Trinitarian? the Moravian? the Southcotonians? Not they. They despise you as much as they do the Pope himself in this respect. Will you explain, therefore, who is the Holy Ghost? He then talks of mathematics—to please your imagination, I suppose. I ask you, gentlemen, is not Revelation above the capacity of man? God revealed his sacred mysteries unto us, but they are above our comprehension, and are not to be proved by mathematical calculations. God has revealed certain articles, and insists, as a condition of our being saved, that we shall believe in them on his divine authority; and, as St. Paul says, God captivates our understanding to the obedience of faith. To understand them we must have some motive for doing so. First, whether God has revealed them; and the moment we arrive at that conclusion we are bound, under pain of eternal damnation, to believe them. The question is, then, is that the Bible in which God's holy word is? I have asked him to prove it. He will not do so; but, like your honest reformers of old, he says, he twists, and turns, and presumptuously asserts that he has the Spirit of God, instead of quoting one single argument to prove its divine origin. Was not this the case with Courtenay, at Canterbury the other day? and perhaps he had as much claim to the Spirit as he has. He then talks of images: to-morrow will be set apart for the discussion of that doctrine, and we will see whether he will prove from the Holy Scriptures that it is erroneous. It will be the last day, and it will be seen who does or who does not belong to the Catholic Church of Christ, which was always visible on earth since the days of the apostles, holy and apostolic. I ask you this question, Sir, what church condemned all the heresies that ever appeared in the world? I read for you yesterday the council, the year, the name of the Pope who presided, the name of the heresy condemned from the last General Council of Trent, which condemned your church to St. Peter. I call on him to prove that was his church. Oh, no; he says it

could not be seen. What! can a church be the united, holy, and Apostolic Church of Christ on earth, and be invisible? Was there ever such a contradiction as he was guilty of? He then talks of our bishops in the time of Mary, how they turned round when she came to the throne, and then turned back when Elizabeth succeeded her. I ask him were they ordained over again by Elizabeth—was it not from us they got their ordination, and did you ever deny its validity? This I tell you, Sir, that if you came over to us, we would not receive you until you denied your ordination and consecration, and be ordained anew. Your great Archbishop Cranmer told the King that he had nothing to do round the heads of the bishops, and they were consecrated; and when, in the time of Elizabeth, four Catholic bishops refused to ordain Matthew Parker, she gave Baile and Storey supreme power to do so, saying she would give them a dispensation for any defects which took place in the consecration. We know you forged the records of Lambeth, and it was not until you were attacked by Gregory Martin, that you did so—and even then they were not brought forth for thirty years. It is now evident you forged them, and no one is hardy enough to deny it. When Lingard was attacked for stating, in his History of England, that Matthew Parker was consecrated, he was obliged to state that he was consecrated, but that he did not say it was a lawful consecration. Thus, Sir, are we watchful over the fold of Jesus Christ; and when any of our priests go over to you, you require them to do no penance—you do not call upon them to perform good works, holding that faith alone is sufficient. The moment they come, you send them to preach against Popery—you take them from Anti-Christ, without any preparation, nor do you even instruct them as Catechumens.

Mr. Gregg—We demand a racantation.

Mr. Maguire—Without a trial of any sort, you take the scum of the beast, although Saint Paul says, let a man prove himself. The half hour here ended.

Mr. Gregg then rose—The rev. gentleman talked of ordination, and consecration, and confirmation, and I know not what, but he forgot to say any thing about recantation. I say the original ordination of a Popish clergyman is mixed up with and full of poison, and when one of them comes over to our church, and admits this is the case—that he was made a slave to the devil by it—that he, like Judas, sold his soul for thirty pieces of silver to the devil—until he does all this, and renounces every abomination of your consecration, we do not admit him. You, Sir, (pointing to Mr. Maguire) are none other than an apostate, and pronounced by God as such—you are very skilful; but this I tell you, that if you come back to us, you must read a recantation—a double recantation, such as none others have done who preceded you. I have now before me twenty-one points in answer. My rev. opponent has been turning about, and wheeling about.

A voice in the crowd, "And jump Jim Crow."

Mr. Gregg—Who has shown his claim to the dignity of truth—who has trembled like a man on a shaking bog? Look at him—look at him. I say he is beaten. He is begining to show the white feather; for he says to-morrow will be the last day. I declare to you, Sir, if I were not restrained by a sense of what I owe the chairmen, I would so cover you with shame—

Several voices in the crowd—"Question, question."

Mr. Gregg—We shall have no more dragging through the streets, saying who will tread on that? I have made him as quiet as possible; but now to the point:—I have twenty-one questions to answer, and it is impossible I can go over the whole of them; but there is one thing which he has knocked his head against, to which I beg to call your attention. He says that I believe solely on the authority of the fathers, whereas I only introduced them as accidental or collateral proof. He says his church has canonized the saints; that, I say, is a mark of damnation; for the man that she approves of as a saint is the surest mark of his damnation. Look at Saint Simon Stilites; he was a man who lived in the desert, where he erected a pillar of six cubits high, and lived on it for four years. He left that, and built one twelve high, where he stopped for three years. He next built one of twenty-two cubits, upon which he lived for ten years. And, lastly, one of forty cubits, upon which he lived for twenty years. Here is the life of one of their saints. What a pity it is Mr. Maguire does not go and dwell on one of those cubits. Indeed he would, I imagine, be as good a saint as this Saint Simon, My Roman Catholic brethren, I appeal to your common sense is the conduct of such a man like a true saint living on a pillar? O no, the life of a saint should be doing what I am now—and even what you, Mr. Maguire, are doing. There is something more of common sense in that than to be like this old fellow with his long ears—practising all sorts of fooleries, instead of going about as I have done, preaching the truth as in Jesus, and not stick himself on a pillar as a show, or as a matter of wonder to the world. I ask what would the ladies think of a man who would go and chain himself to a pillar where no one would go near him, with a big cord tied round his body (great hissing and groaning, which lasted for several minutes).

Mr. Nangle—I would sit here for six months, if it were necessary, in order to have Mr. Gregg heard during his half hour.

Mr. Gregg—It is stated that the consequence of this great sanctity in Simon was that he got an ulcer in his leg which was swarming with maggots. Let me tell you, your canonization is only worthy of the devil. I will tell you some circumstances about a poor weaver that I knew in England, which will astonish you; he used to get up early in the morning, and I often saw him at his loom when taking a walk. Oh, his was a divine life; working at his trade, he often addressed his children, saying come, my children, let us serve the Lord. He would then take his Bible, and read a chapter. At dinner time he did the same, and at night, surrounded by his family, he prayed and lifted his hands to Jesus, and then laid down in peace. This was done, though in very humble circumstances; but the Lord was his friend. There was a poor saint—a labouring man—a man whose countenance would strike you with awe, bearing as it did that dignity which must be respected by all, and as he walked through the streets the people made room for him; and here, in the Church of Rome, you have men canonized for making fools of themselves. Simon Stilites, instead of being canonized, should have been in a pillory, and cats pelted at him. I mentioned to you yesterday something about the life of old Benedict Joseph Labre, a man who was so infected with certain insects, that his confessor had always to place a barrier between himself and this saint, that he might not be contaminated; and yet this was the man at whose death miracles were worked. What were they? Now, let me tell you, the body was as foul and as odious a body as ever

existed, and then it is said that this foul, this insupportable body sent forth, after death, the odour of sanctity, and was quite limber. By some accident or another, I believe it was because he was laid on some chairs, his hands stirred, when the foolish ignorant people who were about him cried out "a miracle! a miracle!" Well did I say that this Popish canonization was a brand of apostacy, and destruction and damnation await those who turned thus from the Lord. You, Sir, sneer and laugh when I talk of lifting up Jesus—I tell you you are blaspheming the Lord, and calumniating the lifting up Jesus. You, you protest against individual inspiration. The rage which is in you springs from another source, and it is those sneers which make our country what it is, and her people a degraded and a beggared race.

Several voices in the crowd—Question, question, question.

Mr. Maguire.—He is doing you all the service he can, and you will not allow him.

Mr. Gregg—All this misery is poured upon you because the Lord is blasphemed by you—who, instead of Jesus, elevate beggary, superstition, and ignorance. Sir, I'll prove you are the apostate. Hear what is said in the Revelations—"And he hath power, and caused all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive the mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads." There was the mark, and it was 666, which means "the Latin King," "the Latin Pope," and "the infallible divine." I like to vary matters a little, and, will, therefore, tell you a story (loud laughter). The other day a number of priests, after leaving this, took a car to go home, and what do you think was the number?—666! (groans, cheers, laughter, cries of question, and confusion)—as much as to say they are—(confusion continued).

Mr. Maguire.—That's as true as every thing else you said.

Mr. Gregg.—They say they can consecrate every thing. I warn you, that you blaspheme God, and damn your own souls. You can consecrate a great long, long, long sword, to convert us all with, and make us as limber as your saints. I preached a course of sermons, some time since, proving that the consecration of the Popish chapel, on Arran-quay, was giving it to the devil. I printed those sermons, and no priest came forward to deny it. If any thing like that was said to me, I would drag him forward, and make him hold his peace. I tell you I am the true shepherd of Christ's Church, and that I will drive away every thing, before me. Your consecration is the devil's. You have said that I took the authority for my Bible from profane history. I told you there was a stream of truth running through the darkness which encompassed your church—I said there were holy witnessess to that stream, who were murdered by you, and their blood is upon you (loud laughter). We did not take the Scriptures on the authority of your church. No, Sir; we got it from those holy witnesses who exposed to the world those diabolical perversions which you introduced into them. Are not those books which you call Apocryphal full of blasphemies, and do they not recommend murder? I tell you every thing you have is corrupted by the devil. You say we have omitted to translate the names of several places which you name, such as Africa; but, Sir, we think where there is an uncertainty it is better to leave people to judge for themselves. I have nothing more to say, because he has left me nothing more to say. He talks of public judgment and private judgment, and then he says, why don't you attack the Unitarians; and so

on? The reason is, we attack the mother of error first; and I say to you, tremble for your apostacy, and turn away from our errors. He asks would Doctor Urwick, or Doctor Cooke, or Mr. Pope join us, or come into our church? My answer is, would they go into his? Therefore, it is not the Church of Christ. I am ashamed of you, Sir; and, I again say, that your church was invisible, and that you perverted the truth.

Mr. MAGUIRE—Prove it.

Mr. GREGG—Here it is—read the eleventh chapter of the Revelations, which I shall hang as a millstone round your neck (continued laughter). The witnesses are Zachariah and Zorobabel, with Enoch and Elias, the former representing the Jews when they were in captivity in Egypt. The church was then hid as if in darkness, but it arose into a pillar of light. Just as the Israelites were then, so you are now. Your church has nothing but the dregs—all the gold has been turned out of her. You are on the eve of judgment, and I tell you you settled yourself by bringing on this discussion. I say unto you,—"Woe, woe unto the scribes and pharisees, and hypocrites, for you are as white as the sepulchre, but within you are foul, and full of abominations." Listen to my warning voice (laughter)—"Come out of her, my people, for Babylon is fallen for ever." If I beseech of you to do so, you will answer me, like the woman in Sheffield, who said—"It won't fall, nor it shan't fall" (laughter). The seven-hilled city is built on brimstone; Rome is founded upon a terrible volcano. The Lord has but to strike her, and she is blown up.

The half hour here closed, and the assembly separated quietly.

NINTH DAY.

THURSDAY, June 7th, 1838.

It being understood, from the correspondence which took place between the Rev. Mr. M'Namara on the part of Mr. Maguire, and the Rev. Mr. Nangle on that of Mr. Gregg, and which had been published in the morning papers of yesterday and to-day, that the discussion would terminate this day, the Round-room was crowded to an excess which far exceeded what had been the case in any of the preceding days since the commencement; but, notwithstanding that the crowd was so great, the best order was presered, through the exertions and precautions of the police.

Mr. MAGUIRE rose at eleven o'clock and said—I call on Mr. Gregg to proceed with the discussion, by proving that the invocation of saints is false and damnable doctrine.

Mr. GREGG—Previous to proceeding with the subject of this day's discussion we have a preliminary work to perform. I call on the Rev. Mr. M'Namara to read the correspondence which has taken place between him and my friend, the Rev. Mr. Nangle, on the subject of closing this discussion. I do so, because I think that the public should have this correspondence before them, in order to be able to judge of the result.

Mr. M'NAMARA.—This correspondence has already been before the public, and I think it quite useless to occupy the meeting by having it read here; it can only detain the meeting unnecessarily.

Mr. Gregg.—I beg, with great respect—and I say this sincerely, for the conduct of the Rev. Mr. M'Namara has been such, since the commencement of this discussion, as to merit and command that respect—I beg then to differ with him, and to say that, in my opinion, it would be very necessary that this correspondence should be laid before the meeting. I, however, only propose that it should be read, as I cannot insist on it. If the proposal for terminating the discussion had originated with me or my brother, I should think it right that my chairman should be called on to read the correspondence which ensued on the snbject.

Mr. Magnamara—I don't say that I have any objection whatever to this correspondence being read, beyond that of its being useless, and only calculated to waste the time of the meeting, and delay the discussion.

Mr. Gregg—There is a reason which makes me think it most important that my request should be complied with, for I desire that those letters should form a part of the report of this discussion, and go with it to the world. I stand up for a great cause, and I think it most essential to that cause that it should be known with which party the proposal for the discontinuance of the discussion originated. If Mr. M'Namara does not think fit to read those letters, I shall call on my chairman to read them.

Mr. Maguire—I, for my part, have no objection that this correspondence should be read.

Mr. Nangle then proceeded to read the letter of the Rev. Mr. M'Namara, bearing date Tuesday last, saying that he felt bound to fix on Thursday for the termination of the discussion, and then his own reply, which was received with cheers by the friends of Mr. Gregg. He then read the subsequent reply of the Rev. Mr. M'Namara, and finally his own rejoinder, in which he gave expression to his sentiments on that subject. And with regard to the refusal of the Rev. Mr. Maguire's chairman to consent to have another day appointed for the discussion of the "Maynooth Theology," to be put by priests to females in the confessional, he said that if it was deemed so very improper that such questions should be handled in an assembly composed entirely of men, he left it to the fathers, and husbands, and brothers of Ireland to judge of the propriety of putting such questions to females in private in the confessional. His reply concluded by saying that if the discussion was to terminate that day, it should be understood that it was without his concurrence or that of Mr. Gregg, and that it was Mr. Maguire who retired from the contest (loud cheers from Mr. Gregg's partizans). He trusted that there would be no demonstration of feeling indulged in on the other side, but that the discussion would be suffered to terminate in the same spirit, and with the same good order in which it had been conducted from the commencement.

Mr. Gregg—I would be extremely sorry if any thing that I have said should lead you to suppose, my friends, that I do not believe that there are, notwithstanding their errors, many amiable and worthy persons in the Roman Catholic Church, and that I do not admit that there are many in her communion who are not guilty of the crimes and abominations which I lay to her charge. Yes, I admit that there are and may be found many virtues among those who profess her doctrines; but I say that those virtues do not come from principle, but from the peculiar disposition of those individuals. Go to the ancient Pagans, and will you not read of many good men who lived among them? Go to the Pagan nations of the present day, and will you not find amongst them several persons remark-

able for generosity, and bravery, and other virtues useful in society: and may we not expect to find the same among the professors of the Romish religion? With respect to my reverend friend, I feel a high sense of his good qualities—I look on him as an example of a bold and stedfast man: and I would be most happy to call him my friend, and stretch out to him the right hand of fellowship, were I not obliged to look on him as the enemy of my Master—were I not obliged to look on him as the enemy of the Lord Jesus, as the enemy of souls. Yes, notwithstanding all his qualifications, and whatever could obtain for him the respect and affection of his fellow men, Mr. Maguire is a wolf in the fold of God, and ravages and destroys the flock of the Lord, and as such I am obliged to raise up my voice against him. I look upon him as the minister of Anti-Christ; yes, my friends, as the minister of Anti-Christ; and when we separate here, as we shall be separated at the last day, for we shall be there separated—I feel bound in duty to apprize him of his error, and of the destruction which awaits him. I shall now proceed with the subject of this day's discussion, and I must be brief as the time is now so short. I shall at once come to that feature of the apostacy about which I am to treat to-day, viz., the invocation of saints; and I beg of you to observe how very striking an ingredient this is in the description of the apostacy contained in that passage of the apostle on which I have principally built my arguments on the subject, viz., I Timothy, chap. iv. verse 1, "In those latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving head to seducing spirits, and doctrines of demons," &c. Now here we have this species of Romish idolatry clearly designated under the name of "Doctrines of Demons." The Pagans held that there were two kinds of Gods—viz. the *Dii majores*, and the *Dii minorum gentium*. The wise among the Pagans probably believed that, in general, there was but one supreme god, and that others were but minor gods, who did not come in collision with him. I shall show how the Popish doctrine of invocation of saints corresponds with the worship of these minor gods. We have in Colossians, chap. ii, verse 18, "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshy mind, and not holding the head, from which all the body by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered and knit together, increases with the increase of God." That is, my friends, let no one induce you to entertain that degree of humility which would make you have recourse only to meditations and secondary means, and neglect the fountain head, which is the Lord Jesus. The following is the note on this text on the Douay Bible:—"That is by a self-willed, self-invented, superstitious worship, falsely pretending *humility*, but really proceeding from pride." Such was the worship that many of the philosophers (against whom St. Paul speaks, verse 8) paid to angels or demons by sacrificing to them, as carriers of intelligence betwixt God and men; pretending *humility* in so doing, as if God was too great to be addressed by men, and setting aside the mediatorship of Jesus Christ, who is the head both of angels and men. Such also was the worship paid by the ancient heretics, the disciples of Simon and Menander, to the angels, whom they believed to be the makers and lords of this lower world. This is certain, that they, whom the apostle here condemns, did not *hold the head*, verse 19,—that is, Jesus Christ and his mediatorship; and therefore what he writes here in no ways touches the Catholic doctrine and practice of desiring our good angels to pray to God for us.

through Jesus Christ. St. Jerome (*Epist. ad Algas*) understands by the *religion*, or service of *angels*, the Jewish religion given by angels; and shows all that is here said to be directed against the Jewish teachers, who sought to subject the new Christians to the observance of the Mosiac law. This, then, is the doctrine of demons, the setting up of mediators between God and men; so that, as the great sin of the Pagans was to worship many gods, in the same manner the great sin of the Papists, the modern Pagans, is to set up a great many mediators. I shall now read some passages to you from Roman Catholic books of piety, to show what the nature of this worship is which they pay to the saints. Here is a prayer to the Virgin Mary, where she is addressed thus:—"Alas! without you, I am lost, unless you obtain for me contrition for my sins." [Here the the Rev. Mr. Gregg read a prayer to the Blessed Virgin from a Catholic prayer book.] There, my friends, is one of those dreadful prayers which I object to as one of the abominations of Popery. And here we have the Litany of the Virgin Mary, in which she is styled "The Tower of Ivory," "House of Gold," "Ark of the Covenant," "Gate of Heaven," "Health of the Weak," "Refuge of Sinners," "Comforter of the Afflicted," "Cause of our Joy," &c. This is most impious, and the whole doctrine of the invocation of saints is one totally unfounded in Scripture.—I shall now make some observations on images. Here I quote from the *Pontificate Romanum*, where we have the whole description of the ceremonies to be employed in the consecration of crosses, with all the benedictions, crossings, sprinkling of holy water, &c. Here it is said, "Incense is handed to the Pontifex"—observe, "Pontifex" the very title applied by the ancient Pagans to their high priests—now I pray you mark that. Then the bishop, the pontifex, sprinkles the cross with holy water, and incenses it, praying that it might it might be sanctified by the Holy Spirit, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and then on bended knees he devoutly adores and kisses it: "*Flexis genibus devoté adorat et osculat.*" But if the cross be not wood, but be made of metal or stone, there is a different course of benediction to be observed. Now, to sanctify by the Holy Spirit means that the Holy Spirit should come and dwell in the object thus consecrated, that it should come down and dwell in the piece of wood or stone. Such an invocation is most blasphemous; it is blasphemy to call on the Holy Ghost to come and dwell in wood or water, so contrary to his divine will. How different is that from the Spirit of the sacred Scripture! How different from the will of that God who calls himself a jealous God. "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquities of fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me." How dreadful and how awful are these words! And it is thus throughout the whole Scripture we read that God will pour out the vials of his anger upon those who will make graven images to worship, or who give to creatures any part of the honour which is due to him alone. It is, then, as it were, that the mind of God bursts out with awful magnificenca in his indignation, and threatens to raise the arm of his vengeance over those who contravene his commands. But Mr. Maguire will say—and mark this, I pray you—that the worship they pay to images and saints

is only relative worship, and does not terminate in them. Let me tell him that the Word of God will permit no such worship. Does he think that the worship of the Israelites terminated in the golden calf—that it was not referred to the God who brought them out of the land of Egypt, and that it was not a figure of Christ? Does he think that the Pagans of Greece and Rome were so stupid and so sottish as to refer their worship to the blocks of wood and stone of which their statues were constructed? No such thing. They believed that there were spiritual and invisible gods, and it was to those that their sacrifices were offered, and not to their images. You say, Sir, that you consult for the simplicity of the vulgar by having the images and pictures of the saints; but I say, let no simplicity induce you to break the express commands of the great and jealous Jehovah. When I enjoy all the blessings of the Gospel—when I have Jesus Christ within me—when I have his promises that he will come and take up his abode with me, why should I fly to images to give some of the honour to them which I should pay to the Lord of all, who is within me? Mark, I pray you, how unscriptural is such doctrine. I do not think that there is any greater abomination in the whole corruption of the Church of Rome than that of the worship which is paid to images Your explanation, Sir, is most useless and nugatory. When I enter a room, and see a man plunging a dagger into the heart of his friend, am I to stop to listen to a syllogism from him to prove that he committed no murder? I have children at home, my friends, and were I to return to them from this place, and with a knife cut off their heads, and cast them to the dogs, I would not be guilty of a greater crime than are the Roman Catholics, who bow themselves down to worship before images! Mark what the Almighty threatened to those who would be guilty of similar crimes—mark the awful and tremendous curses which he pronounced against them:—"Cursed shalt thou be in all things: cursed shalt thou be in thy coming in, and cursed shalt thou be in thy going out." [Here the Rev. Mr. Gregg read some long passages from the prophets, uttering curses against those who would be guilty of the crime of worshipping idols or false gods.] And I appeal to you, my friends, have we not those curses verified in Ireland? "The stranger that is with thee shall rise up and be thy master." It is your religion, Sir, which has raised up the stranger above our heads, and rendered us a nation of beggars, and a laughing-stock to the world. What could be more painful in a foreign country than to see Irishmen laughed at and jeered at as stupid, ignorant, and incapable of doing any good. And, I ask, are not the people of every country in which the Romish religion prevails also miserable and ignorant? Look at Italy, a nation of beggars—take a passing look at Spain, impoverished, ignorant, a prey to the most bloody of civil wars: look at Portugal: look at Austria, wrapt up in the densest veil of ignorance and superstition; look at Naples, where the poor die of want in the strets, while those veiled prophets—and they are in truth veiled prophets—pass them by unnoticed. You may say that those are the accounts of travellers; but they are related by travellers who are worthy of belief, and by what other means could we learn them? for the priests would wish to cover the state of those countries with the cloak of oblivion. But when you look to England, what a glorious contrast do you see: there every poor man stands upon his right, and none can die of poverty. You may speak about poor laws, but where was there a poor law before the Reformation? You may say that the poor could then obtain relief

at the monasteries. Yes, the poor might have recourse to the monks, and get some cold cabbage from them; and the monks might find it profitable enough to send plunderers about the country to make collections, and then dole out a pittance to the starving poor as they might think fit. But now we have the spirit of liberty and independence, the spirit of industry, cleanliness, and comfort, and every feeling which could elevate and dignify humanity disseminated among the people; and for all this we are indebted to the Reformation. On the contrary, in every Popish country we see human nature debased, degraded, and sunk far below its natural level. I have thus, so far, stated my views on the subject—views in which I am most fully borne out by the word of God; all that we have to do to arrive at the truth being to lay down principles first, and then come to details. I now come to the spirit of true religion, and show the contrast which is between that and the spirit of Popery and apostacy on this subject. The character of the true religion is simplicity and purity. I call on the people, in the spirit of true religion, to leave off sin, and I tell them that they have nothing else to hope from, except from the blood of the Lord Jesus, which was shed for their redemption. Then I look up to heaven for a proof of my words, and, behold! the Spirit of God comes down, and I often see his visible influence on the instant among the people—I often see the drunkard leave off his drunkenness, and the debauched man relinquish his crimes from that moment. Here Mr. Gregg's half hour terminated.

Mr. MAGUIRE—My friends, you have just heard an admirable diatribe; such a scolding, indeed, as you could hardly have expected from a Christian. But, as rational men, you will be able to distinguish between vain, empty, frothy tirade, and assertion and sound Scripture proof and argument. My reverend friend tells you that he builds every thing on principles—that he first lays down principles to found his arguments on; but what I have been complaining about since the commencement is, that I can get no principles at all from him—in fact, he has no principles; and yet he tells you that he will give you the principles, but that he has not leisure to enter into the details! He has enumerated to you all the curses which God pronounced against the Jews whom he had chosen, and whom he had brought out of the land of Egypt, for having abandoned him for the false gods of the surrounding nations, notwithstanding all that he had done for them, and for having returned to the flesh-pots of Egypt, as those who join the ranks of my reverend friend do when they return again to the world and the flesh. But how is all that connected with the respect paid by Catholics to the images and relics of the saints? Has he proved that it is such idolatry as that which drew down those curses from the Almighty on the Jews? Now, you have heard a great deal about the omission in our Catechism of that portion of the first commandment which relates to the worship of images or idols, or, as they call it, the second commandment. Yet it so happens that this is a Roman Catholic Catechism, in which the commandments are at their full length, although we did not think it necessary to give more than the heads and substance of the ten commandments in our Catechism, for young children. Here, I say, is one which has them at full length, and has also several questions and answers which follow explanatory of this very portion of the first commandment relating to images, where the paying of that religious worship which should be given to God alone to images, is condemned in terms as strong and explicit as any that could be used on the subject by

my reverend friend himself, however zealous he may be. And observe how, in the Protestant Bible, the words "graven image" are put in, although the Latin word, which explains the sense perfectly, is *sculptile*, that is, "any graven thing:" the change being thus blasphemously made in the word of God in the Protestant translation to suit their own purposes. And in the next words we have "or the image of any thing that is in the heavens above," &c.; that is, "any graven image, or image," thus making a tautology which is unworthy of the sacred Scriptures. There, then, is our Catechism, of which you complain so bitterly for omitting the commandments; and there go your vain accusations against us to the winds. I tell you, Sir, that I, and every Roman Catholic who listens to me, would join as sincerely as yourself in those curses pronounced by the mouth of the prophet against those ungrateful Jews who were guilty of the crime of idolatry; although he may honour and respect the images of those whom God has desired us to honour—although he may fulfil the commandments of God himself, "Honour thy father and thy mother"—"Honour those who are placed over you." My reverend friend talks very hard about my syllogisms, and as I know that he does not like them, and sometimes finds them very hard to digest, I will deal with him in Scripture; and then he may turn up his eyes to heaven, and at the same time that he talks to us about the Holy Spirit entering into his soul, tells us that the church of Christ was buried for 1,800 years in damnable idolatry. Now, with respect to the invocation of angels and saints, I will, in the first place, refer you to revelations, where the inspired writer says, writing to the seven churches, "Grace be unto you, and peace from him who is, and who was, and who is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne." But how should he pray for grace for them from the spirits which are in heaven, unless in heaven there was a regard entertained by those who are there, for us here below? and here grace is prayed from the spirits the same way as from God, to show that the spirits have received a knowledge and regard for the affairs of men from God, similar to that which he possesses himself. I shall produce several texts to support the same argument, and you will see, by-and-bye, to what a pitiable plight I will reduce my reverend opponent. I first proceed to show the differences between the respect which we pay to God and that which he orders us to pay the others, and to those who have his grace on earth. In Genesis, chap. 23. verse 7, "And Abraham stood up, and bowed himself to the people of the land, even to the children of Heth." Thus did Abraham prostrate himself before men to pay respect; and Genises, chap. 43, verse 26, "When Joseph came home, they brought him the present which was in their hand into the house, and bowed themselves to him to the earth," and in several similar texts of Genesis we find the words worship and adored used synonymously; it is therefore to explain the nature of the word that I produce those passages. In 1st Chronicles, chap. 29, verse 20, it is said they all bowed themselves down, and adored the Lord and the king, showing that it is all in the heart that the difference of the adoration consists, for no one would pretend that they adored the Lord and the king in the same manner, or with the same feeling, although the same word is employed to express both kinds of adoration—the one, internal to God, the other, mere external respect to the king. You don't mean that any one who bows before the king at the present time, or who conforms himself to the customs of the Turks in their country, is guilty of idolatry. In Joshua,

chap 5, verse 13, we read, "And it came to pass, when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold there stood a man over against him, with his sword drawn in his hand, and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, art thou for us, or for our adversaries? and he said nay, but as captain of the host of the Lord am I now come; and Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, what saith my Lord unto his servant? and the Captain of the Lord's Host said unto Joshua, loose thy shoe from off thy foot, for the place whereon thou standest is holy, and Joshua did so." Here, then, we have Joshua worshipping the angel, and falling prostrate at his feet, although he declares to him that he is only a captain of the host of the Lord; and in order to show that some places may be consecrated, the angel says unto him, "loose thy shoe, for the place on which thou standest is holy." If a man were to take off his shoes in respect for a spot on which an angel stood, would you not accuse him of idolatry? and yet we have here the angel himself ordering Joshua to do it! O, Sir, you must, I perceive, come to me to be instructed in your Bible. I refer you to 1st Kings, chap. 18, verse 7—"And as Obadiah was in the way, behold Elijah met him; and he knew him, and fell on his face, and said, art thou that, my lord Elijah?" And 2nd Kings, chap. 2, verse 15—"And when the sons of the prophets, which were to view at Jericho, saw him, they said the spirit of Elijah doth rest on Elisha, and they came to meet him, and bowed themselves to the ground before him." If my friend saw us fall prostrate before the image of any of the holy servants of God, how he would roar and bellow at us, und accuse us of damnable idolatry! In the Epistle to the Romans, the Apostle says, "Render to all that which is due: to whom honour, honour;" and Apocalypse, chap. 3, verse 9—"Behold, I will make them of the synagogues of Satan, which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie. Behold, I will make them to come, and worship before thy feet." Here, again, is pointed out the sense in which the word "adore" may be taken, when applied to creatures. Yes, Sir, we shall make you come and adore before our feet; for the stone that is hewn out shall crush you. You have not read the whole passage which relates to that stone, and I must point it out to you in Daniel—"And in the days of those kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break and consume all these other kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever. Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it broke in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold." In alluding to this passage, Sir, why did you not read the whole, and point out how it referred to the kingdom of the church of Jesus Christ, which was as a mountain to fill the whole earth, and which was to last for ever? Allow me to ask you, Sir, where was it for 800 years and more—that mountain that was to last for ever, and fill the whole earth? I return to my proofs. In Matthew, chap. 11, verse 11, it is said—"Verily, I say unto you, among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist; notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." Thus, the least of the saints in heaven was greater than the great John the Baptist! Is it not lawful to pay some respect to them? I refer you again to St. John's Apocalypse, chap. 19, verse 10, where it is said that "And I fell at his feet to worship him; and he said unto me—see thou do it not:—I am thy fellow servant, and of thy

brethren, that have the testimony of Jesus." Now, my friends, I pray you attend to this. Here we see St. John falling down to adore the angel, notwithstanding that the angel said to him "do it not;" and, as if that was not enough, St. John again falls down to adore the angel, who again repeats, "see thou do it not." Now, I ask you, if it were idolatry to adore the angel in the sense in which the word "adore" must then be understood, and in which we understand the word "worship" or "adore" when applied to the saints—I ask you, I say, whether St. John the Evangelist would be guilty of an act of idolatry? Was it not enough that he should be forewarned once—that the angel should have said to him "I am your fellow-servant—recollect that you are the beloved disciple of the Lord, and that by-and-bye you would, perhaps, be raised to a higher place in heaven than that which I enjoy—recollect all that, and see that thou adore me not?" and yet St. John repeated the act! Here, then, Sir, do I meet you on the Bible; and this Christian assembly will expect an answer from you. As to Colossians, chap. 2, verse 18—"Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels," &c. I shall answer the objection brought from it after I have concluded my proofs, and show that the meaning of it is by no means that which my rev. friend would pretend. I now produce Isaias, chap. 63, verse 16—"Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not; thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer." This I appear to quote against myself; but the meaning of it is, that even were Abraham and Israel unmindful of them, the Lord would not, implying that in truth Abraham and Israel, although dead, were not unmindful; and even if they did not, at that time, know what passed on earth, being in Limbo, it by no means follows that since Christ triumphed over death, and carried them with him to heaven, leading captivity captive, they should still be ignorant of that which happens among men on earth. Now, I prove that even then they were not ignorant of those things—for when Dives spoke to Lazarus in the bosom of Abraham, Abraham asked if they had not Moses and the prophets to direct them; but how could he have known that Moses and the prophets ever existed as they lived many hundred years after his death, if he were deprived of a knowledge of the affairs of this world after death, and while yet in Limbo? If asked why no mention is made of the invocation of saints in the gospels, I answer that the four gospels only go as far as the ascension of our Lord, before which time there were no saints in heaven. In 1 Samuel, chapter xviii., we are told that the Witch of Endor brought up the ghost of Samuel to answer the question of Saul; but if it be admitted that a witch, by the power of the devil, could have conjured up the spirit of Samuel to answer the questions of a wicked man, will it be said that angels or blessed spirits could not leave heaven to come to our assistance in necessity. In Tobit, chapter xiii. verses 12, 15, I might quote the words and example of the good Tobias, but my reverend friend throws that book overboard, notwithstanding its great antiquity, and that he has it bound up in his Bible. I wonder how he would bind that book up with the Word of God, according to his principles, rather than Homer or Virgil! In Job, chap. v. verse 1, Eliphas the Temanite, one of the friends of Job, said to him, "Call now if there be any that will answer thee; and to which of the saints wilt thou turn?" To which of the saints wilt thou turn, plainly implying that something was to be expected from the invocation of the saints; and David, in the 98th Psalm, says, "I will sing praises to thee,

O Lord, before the gods," that is, before the angels; but would David say to the Lord, I will sing thy praises in the presence of dead men, in the presence of those who could not hear them? Surely not. O my friends, what a theologian we have got! In St. Luke, chapter xv. verse 10, Jesus says that "There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth;" consequently if the angels know their inward workings of the sinner's heart who repents for his sins, he must, *a fortiori*, know the external acts and the affairs which are going on in the world. In 2 Kings, chap. xx., we are told that the King received a letter from the prophet Elias, who was then seven years dead, or, though not dead, removed from the world. Now, if Elias was so anxious about the affairs of the King of Judea as to send him a letter, being then out of the world, does it not follow that he must have been aware of the affairs of the king, and of the circumstances which were occurring on the earth after his removal from it? Now, Sir, do I not meet you with proofs from the Holy Scriptures? St. Paul, in 1 Corinthians, chapter xiii. verses 9 and 10, says, "For we know in part, and we prophecy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." Here then it is plain that when we shall be perfect in heaven after death, that is when we enjoy the perfection of Christ, the part of our knowledge which is imperfect shall depart, and that which is perfect and which will enable us to know all things will remain. Consequently, the souls in heaven, who do enjoy that perfection, know those things which occur on earth, and at which they are not present. In the Old Testament we find several texts which show us that the thoughts of the heart were known to some of the saints then alive; how much more so should they be known to them when they would become more perfect after death? In the 5th chapter and 4th verse of the Acts of the Apostles, when Ananias told the lie to St. Peter, St. Peter said to him, "Why hast thou conceived this thing in thy heart?" If, then, the saints of God could read the hearts of men on earth, are they to be totally deaf in heaven, and not know either that which passes within or without the heart? In the Apocalypse, chap. ii. verse 26, &c., our Lord says—"And he that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron, as the vessels of a potter, shall they be broken." Surely our Lord here promises that degree of power to his saints, after their glorious triumph over this world, as would imply that they shall be acquainted with the affairs of men; and, in the 3d chapter and 21st verse, he says—"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcome, and am sat with my father on his throne." Is it possible that those who are to sit on the throne of Jesus Christ, which was given to him by the eternal Father, should know nothing whatever of us who are on the earth? What becomes of the article in your creed, which says—"I believe in the communion of saints?" Are we to hold no communion with them after they have been glorified, and have been raised to the crown of their triumph in heaven? Returning to the Old Testament, I again refer to what was said by the friend of Job; and in Genesis, chap. xlviii. verse 16, when Jacob was giving his blessing to the sons of Joseph, he said—"And the angel which redeemed me from all evil bless the lads; and let my name be named on them," &c., where the holy patriarch invokes a blessing on his grandchildren from the angel who brought him out of all danger. But I shall

by-and-bye show from Scripture what the angels do to assist us; and then I shall give, in support of the doctrine of my church, numberless authorities from the holy Fathers, and after that the authorities of eminent Protestant divines. And if he complain of my quoting some of his own doctors against him, I will tell him that those divines were some of the ablest and most eminent bishops of his church.

The reverend gentleman's half hour terminated.

Mr. Gregg.—I feel exceedingly happy in being called on to take p the texts of my reverend friend; and if I do not answer him satisfactorily, and prove that mine, and not his interpretation, is the right one, I am satisfied that the victory should be his. However, he may spare himself the trouble of quoting any of the Holy Fathers against me, for I will answer none of them. Oh, yes, indeed! if he gets me to follow him into that wood, he may say that it is all over with me; for I might wander about there long enough. I do'nt care for the Holy Fathers but I'll go to the grandfathers—I don't care for fathers, or mothers, or brothers, but I'll go to the great Father of all, and that is God! with respect to the Roman Catholic Catechism, that is a more decent one than I expected to see with you, reverend sir. You are coming nearer to us every day, and we shall have you entirely at last. Yesterday you acknowledged that the second commandment was not in your catechism, but since that time you fell by some chance on a more decent one, which you have produced with such triumph here to day; whether it be the one which is used in Ballynamore or not is another question. With respect to the quotation from the Apocalypse, where John writes to the seven churches, saying, "Grace to you from him that is, and was, and is to come, and from the seven spirits, &c." it is evident that he wishes grace from a threefold origin, namely, from Him who is, and was, and who is to come, which plainly signifies the father; again, in the third place, from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, that is from the second place; and finally from the Holy Ghost, who is signified by the seven spirits, and who, although the third person of the blessed Trinity is mentioned here in the second place. I say, that as the two other persons are mentioned by a paraphrase, it was right that the Holy Ghost should also be mentioned by a paraphrase; and finally, that that paraphrase was a proper and significant one, as we know that the influence of the Holy Ghost is exercised by a seven fold grace, which is expressed by a seven fold spirit. This, I say, is the meaning of the text; and I ask, would it not be disparaging to the Holy Spirit, and the Father and the Son should be mentioned, and he omitted, while seven more angels should be mentioned? My reverend friend is very fond of adoring, and must be worshipping images with every thing else. He quotes a text about adoring the Lord and the King; but it is so evident that two very different ideas are implied in this text, that we may suppose another verb to express the second one. But I ask, when the priests of his church shall call down the Holy Ghost to possess images of wood and stone, is it not blasphemy? And when we see a man prostrating himself to worship those images, must we not perceive, how very different such practices are from the spirit of true religion? In the passage quoted by my friend from Joshua, of his falling down to worship the angel, he may depend on it that I will answer him satisfactorily. I say, let the whole result of our discussion depend on my answer to that question; and in saying so, I speak most seriously. Why, my dear sir,

don't you know that the angel here mentioned was the angel Jehovah, Jesus Christ himself—the angel of the covenant—the angel who conducted the Israelites from Egypt, in the shape of a cloud by day, and a pillar of fire by night—he who said my name is written in it? And if you read a little further on, you will find these words—"And the Lord said unto Joshua, see, I will give into thy hands Jericho, and the king thereof, and the mighty men of valour (cheers, mingled with hisses). I wish I had some holy water to sprinkle on those hisses! You are angry with me for telling you the truth. Now, my reverend friend stopped short before he came to this passage, and he was voluntarily blinded; but mark how I hew him asunder with own sword. In the 19th chapter of Revelations, where St. John prostrates himself before the angel, does not the angel say to him "see thou do it not?" And again, where the same act was repeated by St. John in the 22d chapter, it is strange that the very same words are used by the angel, "see thou do it not." Why, my dear sir, how could you fall into so deplorable a mistake? How could you have shut your eyes to the truth which shone so clearly from the word of God? Again, you say that the stone which was not hewn out by hands was the Roman Catholic Church. Am I never, then, to get out of this delusion? Here is your church (here Mr. Gregg unfurled his picture, which he called the "platform of truth," and which was greeted with laughter, accompanied with groans and hisses, and loud cheers from the opposite party)—here, I say, is the picture of your church; and I will hang it here during the remainder of the discussion (cries of question, question). I say it is the question; I must be allowed to illustrate the matter my own way.

Mr. Maguire,—Oh, let him go on.

Mr. Gregg.—Here is the primitive gold, my friends, which soon becomes corrupted, and runs out into an immense stream of corruption: here is the origin of the Irish Church, from the primitive gold, but which also becomes corrupted, and there it runs, one mass of apostacy. There, I say, is the Irish Church, that great parallel stream of scarlet corruption, until it changes back to the primitive gold of the Reformation; and here, again, is old Rome spirting out her filth and abomination, until it gradually corrupts almost the whole mass once more (cries of we want to hear proofs). Mr. Maguire says that the stone which was not hewn by hands is the church; I say that we are the stone; it is we who are smiting and crushing you; we will reduce you to dust and powder, and you will be scattered by the winds of Heaven. Sir, you cannot stand before us. He never gives us any principles; he jumbles a number of texts together, and explains nothing. He then proceeds to prove that the saints are not ignorant of what is passing on earth; now, I ask, is that the question? I admit that the saints may know something of what is going on here below; but I say that there is nothing in Revelation to prove that they are cognizant of all that is going on here below; therefore, I ask you on what grounds you pray to them? [Here Mr. Gregg made a long pause, looking at Mr. Maguire, which produced a burst of laughter.] I may ask my brother Nangle to pray for me, but what reason would I have to kneel down here, while he would be in the island of Achill, and say, Oh, brother Nangle, pray for me? What kind of notions have you of Heaven, I should like to know? What narrow views have you of the regions of the blessed? Do you look upon it as some square or round place above our heads, where all the souls are congre-

gated together? or rather is it not every where, where the blessed spirits enjoy the bliss of the Divine Presence? Now, give me leave to ask you, if a saint was in some of the stars, a hundred thousand miles away, would it not be very ridiculous for us to pray to him, supposing that he could hear us? If the mediation of the saints were of any use to us, ought we not at least be first sure of their presence, so near that they could hear us speak to them? I am sure that you would like very well to have the prayers of Dr. MacHale, but would there be any reason in your kneeling down here to ask them, while Dr. MacHale was in Tuam? Oh, it is a most dreadful thing for us to pretend to knowledge which we can never arrive at! and can any thing be more presumptuous than to deprive God of his rights, by praying to those who know nothing at all about us, instead of sending up our petitions to him, who alone can assist us? My reverend friend argues thus: a dead man in hell prays to Lazarus in the bosom of Abraham, therefore we should pray to the saints? Now mark that, I pray you. A damned spirit addresses himself to Abraham, who rejects his prayers, and that is an argument for the invocation of saints! That is just such another *non sequitur* as all his other arguments. But I, my friends, I stand up for the all-sufficiency of Jesus Christ—I point him out to the people, and tell them to direct their prayers to him, to look up to him for all they want, and that grace and every blessing they could wish for will be poured down upon them. And here a man comes to tell me that I must go and pray to the dead! that I must fly for succour from the living to the dead! They may be in glory, but how do they know any thing about me? Alas! we find the miserable results of this doctrine in the poverty and wretchedness and debasement which exists everywhere where it is preached and received! I say that he offends God most grievously by preaching up that practice; and he accuses me of fanaticism for addressing myself to the Lord Jesus to send down his Holy Spirit on me and on his people. I ask you if his doctrines are not those of the apostacy? He argues from the words of Job's friend —"To which of the saints wilt thou now turn?" Is not that my best argument against him? for the words plainly signify that he has no relief to expect from any saint. It is just the same as if I should now ask of my reverend friend in this, his hour of misery and overthrow, to which of the saints he should look so extricate him. I would clearly mean by the expression that none of the saints could save him from defeat. You speak, Sir, of the letter which was sent from Elias to the King, but have you proved that that letter was not written in a prophetic spirit by Elias before his death, and delivered to the King at the fitting time? This is the opinion of some divines, and it is that which I prefer, although some other opinions are entertained by others. I ask you again, my dear Sir, should we pray to the saints when we have the Lord Jesus ever ready to listen to us, and ever able to assist us? There is not a single question in which your overthrow is more decided than in this. You might as well argue that because the earth produces the necessaries of life and all that we want in this world, that therefore it possesses life, and should be the object of our worship, as to argue from the living to the dead; that is, that because we should ask those of dead men? Observe, it is written that where they should be overthrown in stony places, they should be angry; and it is thus with you—you are angry with me for your overthrow; but then I assure you that I entertain no bad feelings against you, and that if you come over to us you shall be most welcome. In quoting

the example of the witch of Endor, you forget the opinions of divines, that the spirit which was raised, and which personated that of Samuel, was in reality the devil himself; for you recollect that he told lies to Saul, and it would appear that his whole object in thus coming forward was to drive Saul into despair, and thus make sure of the unfortunate King. Hence I say, that if you are obliged to go to the interference of the devil for an argument, you are driven rather hard. As to Tobias, whom you quote, we fling him overboard altogether. His book is evidently spurious, for it contains practices of witchcraft and spells which would be unworthy of the word of God; and if we still bind it up in our Bibles, it is not with the intention of making it an authority to quote from. Observe, I pray you, how Mr. Maguire perverts the meaning of the Scriptures. In the 13th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, quoted by him, the knowledge which is spoken of, and which he read, extend to terrestial things, is evidently a divine knowledge and that which has for its sole object the Supreme Being—that knowledge which we believe will absorb the whole faculties of the blessed in the other life.

Mr. Grégg's half hour ended here.

Rev. Mr. Maguire.—I beg leave to tell you, gentlemen, that it is of us he has been speaking. It is we who only know and prophecy in part; but when we come to the mansions of glory in the presence of our God we will know and understand the entire. And did he not quote a text which exactly went to prove that? He asks me to prove that the saints both hear and can help us, and I will do so; but before I proceed to that I will convict him of perversion of the holy Scriptures. You tell me, Sir, that it was Christ Jesus that Joshua worshipped; why, Sir, is it not said the angel whom he worshipped was a Captain of the Host of the Lord, and is that a proper title for the Lord of Hosts himself? You say that it was the same angel that spoke to Moses. Why did not the Lord say to Moses, when giving him the commandments, "I am the Lord thy God;" and is it not exprersly declared that it was only an angel that spoke to Joshua? Now, how could he be only a Captain of the Hosts of the Lord, if he were the Lord himself? I would be glad if you would satisfy the meeting on that head. You talked of commentators. I wish you would produce them, I wish you would give me any reason for saying that it was not Samuel himself that was raised by the witch of Endor. Now, as to our using a number of mediators, we all hold, Sir, that Jesus Christ is the only mediator. You admit that the Saints can hear us, and yet you say they know nothing about us. What good is their hearing, if they can't understand? You talk, then, of asking a fellow-creature, miles away from us, to pray for us as ridiculous. Why, Sir, did not St. Paul ask people thousands of miles from him to pray forhim to the Lord? Oh, Sir, you may turn up your eyes in surprise, as you do at most that I say. Did he not write to the Colossians to pray for him? Did he not write to the Ephesians and Galatians for the same purpose? He did not know if all he wrote to were alive, but he knew if even they were not, they knew what was going on on earth, and that he would have their prayers before the throne of God. Now, Sir, you want a text to prove that the Saints do pray for us. I refer you to Zachariah, chapter i, ver. 12—"Then the angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah against which thou hast had indignation these three score and ten years?" There is an angel praying to the Lord for Jerusalem; and now, gentle-

men, I beg of you to attend. Mind what the Lord says in answer, "And the Lord answered the angel that talked with me with good works and comfortable words." Thus the angel of the Lord having prayed for the city and of Jerusalem, and the entire Jewish nation, the Lord heard his prayer, gave him a favourable answer. Now, there's a text that goes directly to prove that angels do intercede for men. I would be glad that you would answer it. It would give me great satisfaction, and no doubt it would be pleasing to all the gentlemen present. Now, what was the precise answer of the Lord? and remember, that I take all these texts from the Protestant Bible. Therefore, thus saith the Lord of Hosts. "I am jealous for Jerusalem and for Zion with a great jealousy; and I am very sore displeased with the heathens that are at ease, for I was but a little displeased, and they helped forward the affliction." "Therefore," saith the Lord, "I am returned to Jerusalem with mercies; my house shall be built in it," saith the Lord of Hosts, "and a line shall be stretched forth upon Jerusalem." Thus the Lord yielded to the prayer of the angel, and because of it had mercy upon Jerusalem. I now defy you to produce a single text contradictory of that in the whole Bible; and is it not a clear proof that the Lord listens to the prayers of his angels in favour of man. Now I refer you to 1st Kings, chap. xv. ver. 4, "Nevertheless, for David's sake, did the Lord his God give him a lamp in Jerusalem to set up his son after him." Thus, you see, for David's sake, who was long dead at the time. the Lord did this. Again, did not the Lord protect Jerusalem from the Assyrians on account of his servant David? Again, he says I quoted from Job, and he maintains that the answer of Job's friend, Elias, means that the angels could do nothing for him. Well, I care not if it does mean that, for I quoted the passage only to show that it was a very ancient and general practice to invoke the intercession of angels. Sir, I will soon retort your arguments upon yourself. I refer you now to Jeremiah, chap. 15, verse 1—"Then, said the Lord unto me, though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people: cast them out of my sight, and let them go forth." Now, attend to that, my brethren. Moses and Samuel were both long dead, yet the Lord said if they were before him, that is, if they prayed to him, he would not hear them, clearly showing that they could pray for the people. Let me ask you, also, would God Almighty say that he would not hear them in that particular case, if he never heard them in any? How did the Lord act when Moses interceded for the Israelites? He begged him not to interfere between his wrath and the people; but Moses did pray for them, and for the sake of one man, and that a man whom he did not permit to enter the Holy Land, for his want of faith, pardoned the entire nation. But remember also that Moses was then a human being like ourselves; and if God will listen to and grant the prayers of a sinner who was deficient in faith, how much more effect may we expect to be produced by the intercession of the saints and angels? When he said of St. John the Baptist that he was "more than a prophet," and that "among them that are born of women, there had not arisen a greater man than John the Baptist," what may we not expect from the prayers of that saint, and of others, when they have entered the kingdom of heaven? I now refer you to Ezekiel, chap. 14, verse 14—"Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness." Now mark here how he mixes one dead with two living persons, to show that the dead can

intercede for their fellow-men as well as the living; but so offended was God with the Jews, that he would not hear them. Again, I refer you to the Apocalypse, chap. 5, verse 8—"And when he had taken the book the four beasts and the four-and-twenty elders fell down before the lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials, full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints." There now, Sir, what do you say to that? The prayers of the saints are contained in the golden censor, and they were presented to God by the four-and-twenty elders. Is not that a glorious proof of the communion of saints? Is it not a proof that the saints in heaven intercede for their fellow-creatures on earth? And now, Sir, is it a dishonour to God to beg of the saints and angels to intercede for you? I say it is not. We acknowledge that Jesus Christ is our sovereign mediator, and that on him alone we depend, How, then, is it derogatory to him to have mediators under him between him and man? If he has saved them by shedding his blood for them, is it not likely that he will listen to their prayers for those for whom also he he shed his blood? There now are the Scriptures for you. Oh, you may laugh, and gnash your teeth, as the Jews did at our Saviour (laughter, hisses, and cheers). That is your answer to me for whatever authority I give you for my doctrines (laughter and cheers). Again, gentlemen, you will find what he says, and how he proves it. You have heard him talk of commentators, and he says he has them to produce in favour of his interpretation of the Scriptures. I wish he would produce them, I defy him to do so. Now, gentlemen, I beg of you to be attentive for a moment. I refer you now, Doctissime Domine Gregg (laughter), to Luther's work on the first commandment. (He read a passage from it, to the effect that he objected to using the intercession of the saints in temporal affairs, and also in some spiritual affairs, and that the church said to Paul, *ora pro nobis*). Now, Sir, there's a passage from the father of your church. I refer you now to tome 6 of the German edition, p. 31, on the *Magnificat*. (He read another passage to the effect that the Blessed Virgin should be prayed to.) Now there's making a petticoat for the Virgin Mary. There's Luther making a petticoat for you. Now, where is your blasphemous language about the mother of your God? I tell you, Sir, we have the true respect for things holy, though we do not worship any one but God. But I know you will say, "What is Luther to me? I don't care for him." Well, Sir, listen to him again——listen to what he says of a man *in articulo mortis*. [He read from him a passage, the effect of which was that in the hour of death a man should call upon Mary and all the saints to intercede for him.] Now, Sir, I will refer once more to Bishop Montague, for whom you have such little respect, and whom you relish so little, though he was a sufficiently bitter enemy of the Roman Catholics. [He read a passage from a work of his to the effect that the saints do interpose and mediate between God and man.] Now, Sir, where is your orthodoxy—where is your piety—where is the strictness of your doctrine?—You will find, in "The Invocation of the Saints," page 118, the following—[He read a passage to the effect that it is no impiety to say, "Mary, or Paul, or Peter, pray for me."] Oh, Lord, do you hear that? There's a Protestant for you! What will you say now? The translation of an ancient work say that the invocation of the saints was practised in the fourth century, and that Pope Gregory, by whom half Europe was converted, and who sent Austin into England, practised and recommended it. Prudentius also tells us that it was the

practice of the church in those early days. So much, Sir, for your pure church—so much for your gold. What answer will you give to that, I would like to know? In the rejoinder to Bristoe you will find this—[He read a passage admitting that Ambrose, Austin, Jerome, Basil, both the Gregories, and many others, used to practice the invocation of the saints.] Now, where is your Protestant authority? where is the impudence with which you accuse us of apostacy, when the members of your own church—yes, and distinguished members—acknowledge and adopt the very doctrines on which you ground your charge? Let him read in Daniel, "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people; but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever." Now, Sir, tell me what church but ours can be signified by that? Our church is the church that has broken to pieces all the heresies that have ever sprung up in the world. I have eighteen councils, which I will read to you, with the Popes that presided at them, and the heresiarchs who were condemned by them.—Ours, then, is the stone signified in the prophecy, and it is indeed grown into a mountain, Christ said, "Thou art Peter," that is a rock, "and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Now, Sir, who condemned Simon Magus, Menander, Parcelean, and the rest who held that *latriæ* or divine honour and sacrifice should be given to the saints? Who condemned the Eunomians, Micheans, Manicheans, and the rest? I ask you now, where was the stone which was to grow into a mountain, if your church was the stone for 800 years that you say it was invisible? During that 800 years, according to you, there was no Protestantism (no, from Mr. Gregg). I say yes, and tell me where was the stone then? (the Rev. Mr. Gregg again displayed, and shook the map). Oh! Mr. Gregg, I don't see your invisible church in that map (cheers and hisses, amid which Mr. Gregg held up the other map.) You see, gentlemen, where he has produced these pictures for the condemnation of himself, The Scripture says that a man shall tell a lie to his own condemnation. He would not be satisfied till, by showing the picture, he made it clear that he was telling a bit of a fib in saying that the true church was invisible, when it never was. That map is, indeed, a picture of the quotation from your own book, one word in which you dare not deny, and to the truth of every word of which you are all bound by a solemn oath. Now, Sir, I will give you a prayer from your own Prayer Book. [He read a prayer beginning with "O, everlasting God," and ending with a prayer to send his holy angels to watch over, and succour, and defend us, through Christ our Lord (cheers and hisses)—"that they may succour and defend us"] (cheers). Now, Sir, indeed, what do you say? Where is your genuine Protestant piety? Now, Sir, you must adopt this, for to every word in the book you have to swear (no, from Mr. Gregg). Now, Sir, where is your blasphemy? Now, how can you, a wretched, withering member of an heretical church, dare to attack the religion of, I may say, the whole world (great groaning, hissing, and cheering)? Gentlemen, recollect that these expressions have been extorted from me, and I am exceedingly sorry for having used them. You must, however, admit that I have had provocation. When I am told that my church and its doctrines are damnable—when you tell me that I am damned (no, from Mr. Gregg). Why, Sir, you told me that you and I would be separated in heaven; that is, that you would be on

the right and I on the left. I tell you that to use such language is blasphemous presumption and ignorance. How dare you, Sir, presume to say who will be saved, or who will not? How can you presume to say you are inspired? Will you show me any text of Scripture that says that the Rev. Mr. Gregg, of Swift's-alley, will be saved? We are told that "No man knoweth whether he is worthy of love or hatred." Now where is your damnable parallel? [The Rev. Mr. Gregg here shook one of his maps at the reverend gentleman] (roars of laughter and hisses). Now, he speaks of Daniel. Let him look to the very verse before that which he quoted. I say our church is the stone which was to grow into a large mountain; and the poverty with which you upbraid us is a never-failing mark of the truth of the church, and the persecution which she has suffered on account of it exhibits it as being purged of the dross of heresy. I tell you, Sir, we are the true church, and in every thing which you advance as a proof of the truth of your church's doctrine, Simeon Stilytes, talk as long as you like, was a holy man; and in our church all the holy men in every age are to be found. Christ said that he would preserve his church immaculate; he would preserve it for ever. How could he do so, if he gave it over into the hands of the blasphemous Luther and Calvin? I have given him a vast number of proofs of various kinds of the doctrine of the intercession of saints and angels. I could give him the holy fathers also, but he hates them; for he knows right well that they are against him. Why Sir, I thought that at least they would be honest witnesses, no matter on what side. There's another proof of his consistency. He refuses to receive the doctrine of the very saints that he has in his own calendar. He blames us for honouring the saints. Does he not consecrate his own churches to their honour and in their names? Does he not consecrate them to Michael, and Peter, and Paul, and other innumerable of the saints and angels? I do not appeal to the holy fathers as infallible, but I did think, and I do think, that they are honest witnesses. They were holy martyrs and glorious confessors, and yet one of the new infidels refuses to receive their testimony. Why, Sir, you are like Voltaire, and Rousseau, and Diderot; you will believe nothing. You care not for Dr. Taylor, Bishop Montague, Dr. Parker, Purdon, or any other of the Protestant writers that I have quoted. No, no, you care not for any individual because you are inspired. Thus are heresy and infidelity dovetailed together. [Here a book was handed up to the Rev. Mr. Gregg, which he put off the table.] I object to any book being handed up in this way. We will have nothing surreptitious—we will have every thing fair, and honest, and open (cheers and hisses). Now, gentlemen, hear me for a moment, and I will give you one other text. Since the cross has been blasphemed, I will give you a text to show you that it should be honoured. Now, I refer you to 1st Corinthians, chap. i. verse 18, "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish, foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God." You laugh at us for making the sign of the cross on our foreheads, but I say we will preserve the cross and honour it in spite of all that is done to the contrary. Again, in Gallatians, chapter vi. verse 14, "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified, unto me and I unto the world." You talk of bowing to Jesus. How often do you bow to him? Do you bow to him in the sacrament? I ask you what is in it but bread and wine? If there be any thing, I ask you what is it but Jesus? If there be nothing,

then you are guilty of what you charge against us. I tell you, Sir, that the Dissenters charge you with it, and therefore they leave you. I tell you that every argument which you advance against me I retort with double force in the name of the Dissenters. Lactantius, a great and pious man, and the instructor of the son of Constantine the Great, says—

The half hour here ended.

Mr. GREGG—Then, the reverend gentleman has talked of transubstantiation. Now, Sir, I propose that we have another day for discussing that subject. Will you (turning to Mr. Maguire) meet me upon that question? Where does truth lie? He talks of being in a rage. Oh! that is evidence that he is standing on a shaking bog. He talks of bowing to the name of Jesus. He says, hail, master, like his prototype, Judas, and then sells him for thirty pieces of silver. Then again we have the cross. Oh, Sir, these are the delusions which are the destruction of our country (laughter). You will think it very odd when I tell you that in his quotations from Luther he read passages from his works written before his conversion. I have his sermons on the ten commandments here, where he expressly says that he wished his former theology should be burned. He quoted the text where God says he would spare the Israelites on David's account, as if God would not promise mercy to the third and fourth generation of the just man; and he therefore concludes that the invocation of the saints is lawful. There is a *non sequitur* for you. I never said the saints heard us or our prayers, but I said that I had reason to believe there was joy in heaven for the conversion of a sinner. So far from saying that they did hear us, I gave an illustration with regard to the heavenly bodies to show that they could not, by any possibility, hear us. Again, he says that the angel before whom Joshua fell down was captain of the Lord's hosts, and that therefore he could not be, as I argued he was, the Lord. Is not Jesus invariably called captain in the Old Testament? and is he not the Saviour of our souls? He then quoted the following text from Zachariah:—"Here the angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation three score and ten years?" I say, if he knew any thing about the Hebrew language he would know that the angel spoken of in this way is the Jehovah, and that that language is common in the Old Testament, when any passages occur which have reference to Christ. Now, Sir, I have answered all your questions (great laughter). I have answered them, and my proof is, that the reverend gentleman runs away (a laugh). This fact will be known in Ireland and throughout the world for ages yet to come, who will see the effects ond mischiefs of Popery. The reverend gentleman tells us about saints and images, and that to reverence them is not idolatry. I wonder that he labours under such a delusion. Here I have a book, printed in 1796, which gives an account of prodigies performed in Rome. The work is published by Keating, a bookseller in London, and translated from the French by the Rev. Mr. Raymond. In that it is stated that images in the chapels in Rome used to lift up their eyes and look at the congregation. One on the high altar of St. Nicholas used, during the sacrifice, to open its eyes and look upon the people, and at the time of consecration, look towards the altar. These things are said to be attested and sworn to by a great many witnesses. Another statue of the Virgin Mary was seen to have a clear colour, and used also, during the time of sacri-

fice, to open its eyes and move the pupils. I could give you a score of instances of the same kind got up to delude man. There we have the ground for the assertion made of miracles being performed in the church, which show that the Church of Rome is the church of Anti-Christ. I was going to the spirit of the true religion, and to show you what the infernal mind of man can do to enslave his fellow-man, and send him to perdition. In the 2d Book of Kings we find that "Naaman came with his horses and with his chariot, and stood at the door of the house of Elisha. And Elisha sent a messenger, saying, go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean. But Naaman was wroth, and went away and said, "Behold I thought he will surely come out to me and stand and call on the name of the Lord his God, and strike his hand over the place and cure the leper." No gentlemen, Naaman would not do that; the washing himself in water was too simple a cure for him; he wanted some show, just like that which is practised now-a-days, and commonly called priestcraft. We have the true religion springing from the fountains of Jesus Christ, and it is not so with Popery. Look at that (exhibiting a scapular, amid the laughter of all present)—there is something to cure the soul of man, and to satisfy blind and dark human nature (loud cries of question, question). This is the corruption which gives a plenary indulgence to the devotees of the holy abbot or the holy friar, as he is called, who founded that institution. That scapular will deliver the person who wears it from hell fire, and from any accident in this world. Indeed it is said that at one time a cannon ball was fired at a man, and that this scapular stopped it, and prevented him from being killed. My dear friends, observe the trickery and the nonsense which the people of Ireland are called on to believe. Here is a miraculous medal, which I suppose they will say performed more miracles than Christ himself. This is to be hung on the tester of a bed, from which great advantages are to be derived. They call the Virgin the Queen of Heaven, but I shall not do so—I shall not give her a character which she is not warranted in receiving. You say she ascended into heaven, although the Scriptures have not one word about it; and oh, Sir, it is here we find the character of Popery. Of course we can't prove a negative—we can't allege positively that such an occurrence did not take place; but all we say, it is not in the Scriptures, and therefore we don't believe it. You talked of idolatry. What is this (taking up a breviary)? *Festum cœne Domini*, the feast of the Spirit of the Lord; and then there's blessing of oil, and other mixtures, &c., out of which the devil is to be put. The bishop says, *Sancta Chrisma*, Hail, holy Chrism! and, after repeating it three times, he kneels down and kisses the bottle which contains it. Is that not sufficient to excite the wrath of a jealous God, who would not allow Moses, for being guilty of a want of confidence in his power, to enter the Holy Land? And here we have the priest saying, "Hail, holy Oil!" and bowing down to adore it (here the reverend gentleman imitated the bowing down, amid great laughter). I ask you, gentlemen, in the face of the living God, is not that blasphemy, and are not such practices dreadfully injurious to the honour of the Lord Most High? They have holy oil and holy water, and holy salt and holy ashes; and I tell you your very baptism is invalid —it is corrupt. You make crosses, you anoint, and you profane, as if to drive away ten thousand devils (roars of laughter). You tell me that it is lawful to bless any of God's creatures. I grant you that—but not to

make them the occasions of blaspheming the Lord Most High. It is done to make him drive the devil out of things. How comes it that you do not proceed with a different course? Why not begin at the beginning (laughter)? Let me ask, why did you say we admit the invocation of saints in our Book of Common Prayer? We do not, Sir; here is the prayer (the reverend gentleman here read it out of the book and proceeded). Oh, Sir, it is a beautiful example of the wisdom of the Church of England that it is a prayer to God alone, and not to any creature or thing. You cannot find where it is either in our Book of Common Prayer or in our Homilies. You questioned me the other day about misquoting history, which I find, on investigation, I have not, although at the time I only depended on my memory; but it is not so with you. You have misquoted history and the Holy Scriptures, which shows, beyond any possible doubt, that the Lord has visited you with judicial blindness (laughter). Rise from it, rise from it—run away, run away, from the abominations of Popery. You have spoken of Luther, and you said he had a conference with the devil, who persuaded him to leave off saying private masses. No, Sir, that is not the case; he was persuaded to do so by the living God, and not by the devil, who, on the contrary, pressed him to continue it, but he refused, and was exceedingly right in doing so. I now come to my question, why don't you begin at the beginning (laughter)? Do not the laws of the land declare that your religion is impious and idolatrous, and that your church was sunk in superstition throughout the world for 800 years and more? Why do you not come forward and insist that the law should be repealed? Why do you not insist that you are to be no longer stigmatized as an idolater, instead of which you allow yourself to be branded with that appellation? I tell you, Sir, that if I were branded with that idolatry, I would protest against it (laughter); and you should do so likewise, if you were in the right, and insist that I should have no ascendancy over you. I tell you more, Sir; that if I were arraigned before an idolatrous judge I would not plead before him, and here I protest against any authority being given to idolaters. Why, Sir, and I put it to you—why have you been branded with idolatry? Because you are an idolater (laughter). What has been your whole business during this discussion? You have been disparaging Christ, by calling for proofs of the authenticity of the holy Scriptures—you have been guilty of infidelity—you condemn me because I believe them, and because I rejected every thing, placing reliance on Jesus Christ alone, through whom we are to get peace and pardon. Your whole business has been to attack and condemn the power of his holy church. You run away from the question (laughter); if not, then, I dare you to continue it. Oh, my Roman Catholic countrymen, tremble for yourselves; and I now give notice that, as soon as my strength shall be be restored, I will give a public lecture in this room, for which I got a requisition some time since, when I will point out to the government of the country the best mode of converting you all (great laughter), and convincing you that the truth is in Jesus. I was a weak man commencing this contest—I was nobody; but you, Sir, have gifted me with a power calculated to give ten thousand overthrows to the great apostacy (laughter). That has been my constant prayer to God for many years—prayers which I have recorded in my journals (laughter). I have seen the miseries which you were subjected to, and I prayed for you. I begged of the Lord to give me power to remove the evils, and he has gifted

me with the power. I am certain he'll grant me grace to exert that power, whereby I may be enabled to serve Ireland, and rescue her from her wicked ways—when you will abandon your apostate bishops, and your consecration, and your religion, and come back to us (loud laughter). Do as Mr. Crotty did—come back to the church of Christ, where you will find peace in that Saviour and glory in your own righteousness. I pray God that my labours may have that effect, for I could not be better employed. It would be a great deal better for you to be out sporting with your dogs than be sifting females; and if every priest gave up that sort of work, and take and enjoy his field sports, we should have our country better than we have at present. Your efforts do nothing but spread damnable doctrines. They demoralize the people, and and inflict serious injury—injury on the church of Christ. Babylon the great is fallen! fallen! fallen! Come out of her, my people. Sir, the discussion is now ended, because you ran away (loud laughter); take my advice and stay at home in Ballynamore, for there is not a clergyman into whose parish you may hereafter go that will not drag you forward and expose you. [The half hour here ended.]

Mr. Maguire—Gentlemen, if you give me a patient hearing. [Here some person began to make a noise, which disturbed the meeting, but he was immediately removed by the police.]

Mr. Maguire—You will be pleased to observe that my friend has given us a vast deal of abuse, a great deal of assertion, but not one word by way of argument. He told us distinctly that he came here to convert us. I believe he never said a truer word in his life—but he has made a pretty exhibition. He then talked of my field sports. Oh! I pity the man who finds fault with another because he enjoys rational exercise, in order to enable him to fulfil with more zeal those duties which he is called on by the ternal God to perform. To what extremities must he be driven to when he has had recourse to such miserable shuffling. In the name of God, why did he upbraid me for going to take cheerful exercise? But no, I will let it pass, and I shall make no further observation upon it. I quit that subject, for, thank God, I am not the man who hypocritically declares to the world my own righteousness, and to declare I recorded my own prayers and my own good works in a journal, which I kept for that purpose. That, Sir, is downright knavish imposition. I have argued from the commencement of this discussion from the Holy Word of God. I have given no assertion of my own, but from that sacred book. I did not claim credit from profane history, or my own private judgment. No, Sir, my authorities have been all through from God's Holy Book, and from the writings of Protestant fathers, and so far I have a claim upon your attention. I have not declaimed, nor have I ranted—for where declamation begins common sense ends; and, I ask, was there ever a man who laid claim to private qualification that was not a heretic, and condemned by the church of God? for that was the rock they all split upon. Our blessed Saviour never lost his temper (if I may use such an expression as applied to the Man God) but when denouncing the hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees. You, Sir, say I ran away from this discussion. I will appeal to a gentleman who is, I believe, a man of honour. I ask him as a clergyman, though I deny the validity of his ordination—I appeal to him as a man of truth—was it fair or honourable of him to insert, in his letter to my chairman, that I had declined the discussion? What right had he, or any other man, to

reduce me to the necessity of listening to the foul abominations which have been wilfully, and maliciously, and falsely translated from the Theology of Peter Dens? I declare here, solemnly, that I will prove the scandalous exaggerations and the corrupt and wilful misrepresentations which have been had recourse to with regard to that book, before a fortnight or three weeks—if I have a scholar and a gentleman to deal with. What, Sir, I ask you, am I to stop here until Christmas Day next, and hold a controversy with a man who never answers one argument I put forward (loud cheers)? I ask you have I not quoted thirty texts of Scripture this very day, to prove the invocation of saints? and out of these you only attempted to answer two; and God knows how you succeeded. What have you said with regard to the angel in the Apocalypse? that, indeed, when St. John knelt down and worshipped him, he only paid him the same respect as he would a king.

Mr. GREGG—No, no?

Mr. MAGUIRE—Your words are recorded against you; and was not that my argument, that St. John only paid the angel the same homage as he would a king. Mr. GREGG—I deny that.

Mr. MAGUIRE—You can't get out of it now; the gentlemen who attend here have it down, and that will settle the transaction. Did you deny that he worshipped the angel? And if he did so in the sense in which we both agree, what difference does it make if the same is done as far as regards a saint? We only do to them what you would do to your archbishop, more particularly if you expected a living from him (a laugh). Would you not be respectful to him? eh, doctor? You would honour him, actuated by one motive—we honour the saints, actuated by another; we honour the saints because they are the servants of God, and because we believe they will intercede for us at the throne of the eternal God. You stated, Sir, that I misquoted history, and that I also misquoted the sacred Scriptures. Do you think those who hear you will believe you? I dare you—I challenge you to show where or when I have done so; and, when this discussion is published, the world will judge of the truth of your assertions. I know well what difficulties will be thrown in my way, and what attempts will be made to prevent its publicatton. He says he has all the arguments. Pray, what arguments did he use? What single proof has he given for any one article of his faith which he has put forward? He talks of Anti-Christ.—I ask him how is it that Henry the Eighth, the original head of his church, allowed himself to be called the "Defender of the Faith?" And by what strange inconsistency his successors carefully preserve it, although they received it from a Pope who must, according to Mr. Gregg's argument, be Anti-Christ? You, Sir, have liberated this same Anti-Christ from the power of Bonaparte, and yet you talk so much about it. What consistent Protestantism!—Why do you say so much? Oh! it is evident, because you are obliged to swear upon the Holy Evangelists of God that the invocation of saints is damnable and idolatrous, and it is to screen yourself from the charge of wilful and corrupt perjury that you pursue the course you have pursued. I have quoted to-day against you the bishops of your own church—men far more learned than you are—for you throw the holy fathers overboard—for what are they in comparison with the great Mr. Gregg, of Swift's-alley (laughter)? I quoted Luther to show what inconsistencies he was guilty of. Oh! but says Mr. Gregg, what a blundering mistake you made. Where have I made it? Point it out, if you

please. Did he not state that he was induced to discontinue private masses in consequence of five arguments urged by the devil against it? And why do you say then that I misquoted him? How can you reconcile the contradictions of the early reformers? Were they all right? Or, if those who differed from each other were inspired, how can you reconcile their contradictions? Surely the Holy Ghost did not inspire them all; and you won't say that he could be the author of contradictions. Have you answered one single argument which I put forward? If I quote the holy fathers—oh, say you, a fig for them: what care I for their authority, for I am inspired! Good God! to what have we come to, when a man stads up in a Christian assembly and says, "I am inspired!" (cheers) He talked of miracles, of consecration, and of holy water; did he deny the miracles—did he bring forward one single proof to show they were not wrought? Oh, no, he says, I can't deny them, but then they were performed by Anti-Christ (laughter). He came here in his pontificals on Saturday—were they blessed? Mr. Gregg—No, no,

Mr. Maguire—If I had them I'd soon knock the devil out of them. Have you not, Sir, often read of the great exorcists? and I must tell you that humbug was your object in coming here; to gull, if possible, these deluded people who believe in you, and who imagine that your empty assertions are gospel truths, and must be believed. You know that Moses erected a brazen serpent in the wilderness, and not only that, but he caused figures of men, &c. to be erected before the ark. We also know that David danced in presence of the ark, and that it was said he danced before the Lord because the ark was considered a representation of the Lord, or at least of the law, which he gave unto his people. Do you not respect your Bible as much, and more than even we thought of respecting Saints or Angels? Then if we are idolaters so are you; for if we respect Angels, you pay more than common veneration to your Bible. You talk of transubstantiation, and you ask me will I meet you? Where is the use of my remaining here reasoning and arguing with a man whose only reply is preaching a sermon, and telling the people to look on Jesus, and blasphemously asserting that you are inspired by the Holy Ghost? Have you put any thing forward with which a man could grapple, or am I to take your word for every thing you say?—You know that Simon Magus and Marcion laid claim to the same individual inspiration; and I ask you in the presence of these gentlemen, to tell me what authority have you for saying that you are inspired, or do you think they will believe you? I asked you, Sir, where was the Church of Christ for 800 years or more, before the Reformation? Did you give me an answer to that? I asked you to prove 22 out of the 39 articles of the Church of England from the Holy Scriptures? Did you do so? I asked you was private judgment (that which made Luther apostatize) your sole rule of faith? You never replied to that. I asked was the public judgment of the church to be the sole rule of faith, and, if so, how would you settle a difference between private judgment and public judgment, if they came into collision?—You passed that by. I asked you if private judgment were to be the rule of faith, how you would reconcile St. Paul's appeal against certain Jews to the council of apostles at Jerusalem, when they decided in his favour, and concluded with the memorable words, "It seems good to the Holy Ghost and to us?" I asked you to what church Martin Luther made an act of faith, when he apostatized; and where was the Catholic Church of Christ, if it were not the Church of Rome? You gave me no

answer. I asked you how you could convert a Jew, if he asked you what authority you had for your Christianity? You gave no answer, except your holding out the Lord Jesus Christ. I asked you how could Jesus Christ be with his church, or how could her sacraments be administered, if that church were invisible for eight hundred years? You were silent. I asked you how could she be universal, which you admitted she ought to be, if she were idolatrous for eight hundred years? To that you gave me no reply. I asked you what single church that was ever in the world believed in the Thirty-nine Articles but the Church of England? Or from whom did Luther get his mission ordinary or extraordinary? No answer. I asked you how could he or any Protestant make an infallible act of faith on fallible authority? You said, in answer to this, that you would not say whether the church was fallible or infallible. I asked you to prove the succession of your bishops up to St. Peter? You did not answer. I asked you to prove the inspiration of the Apocalypse, or how a branch lopped off from a tree could flourish, or a stream from a well, when the communication was cut off, could flow? You gave no answer. I asked you whether the church became heretical—or if so, what was the heresy and what was the period—who was the Pope—what emperor or king reigned—or what historian recorded the occurrence? No answer. As you admitted the four first general councils of the Catholic Church, I asked you were they not guilty of an invasion of the divine right of private judgment, and therefore of the rule of faith established by the Holy Ghost, for condemning those who exercised that right, and by what authority did they do so? I asked you if that authority existed then, had not the Council of Trent, which condemned Luther and Calvin, the same right? Mr. Gregg—They had not.

Mr. Maguire—That is assertion. You did not, when called on, prove the contrary (cheers). I asked you to name me any instance where Catholics, who lived in that religion, died Protestants, although I proved to you that many Protestants died in the Roman Catholic communion. Here you were also silent. I demanded of you to prove from the Holy Scriptures that there were but two sacraments, but you were silent. I argued that the church was above the Scriptures, therefore, the Scriptures could not be a rule of faith; and I ask you, as a man of honour, did you offer one argument to disprove what I stated? I said that infallibility could not proceed from fallible authority, and how could a Protestant, therefore, make an act of faith?—Not a word in reply. I asked you to prove your Bible to be canonical, or whether your baptism was valid, and you declined answering. I implored of you to say whether, if the text, "The Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son," were omitted, how could you prove the doctrine of the Trinity against the Unitarian? To this you said you did not care one farthing, as you knew it was the word of God. I asked you to prove by what authority Sunday, the first day, was substituted as the Sabbath for Saturday, when the latter was made so expressly by God himself. You gave no answer. "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing from Jesus Christ himself;" and I asked you how could these doctrines have found their way into the world without preaching—and how could preaching be practised for eight hundred years, if no visible church existed? No answer. I asked you to prove that fasting was unlawful. You gave no reply. I asked where was the perpetual sacrifice which was to be offered to God, spoken of by the prophet Daniel? You gave no reply. You admitted the council of Jerusalem,

which proscribed fasting. Your own church recommends it, and I asked you why you do not fast? but you were silent. I asked you to show who it was that gave you the commandments, or who it was that divided them from the Scriptures, whether private judgment or public judgment was the rule of faith? Mr. GREGG—Both.

Mr. MAGUIRE—Well, then, if a collision were to take place, who was to decide? You did not answer that. I demanded of you to prove that confession was not a divine institution, and that absolution given in the confessional was not valid. No answer. I asked you to prove the 14th psalm, and I made you admit you were not able to answer me. I ask you, Sir, do I run away from this discussion? Have we not been nine days at it, and what have you adduced to support your propositions? I have only to say that I hope we shall depart with good feelings towards each other. For myself I have only to say that mine are the same as before the contest begun. If I have been compelled to use observations against my Protestant fellow-countrymen, which I deplore, they are not less true—but I am only sorry that I was compelled by dire necessity to hurt the feelings of any man; but, gentlemen will allow for that, when it is taken into consideration the provocation which I received. I was told I belonged to the serpent—to Anti-Christ—to the great apostate; and can you, under these circumstances, be angry with me for fastening this apostacy on Luther and Calvin, the founders of the Protestant Church? Luther says there was no visible church for one thousand years on earth until he appeared. The Church of England says it was for eight hundred years or more.—And, in the name of God, where was it? And am I not bound to brand every man with falsehood who says my Church is that of Anti-Christ, when those very men admit they got their ordination and their consecration from us—from a Church which was known to the whole world, since the death of Christ to the announcement of the doctrine of these pretended Reformers? I ask you, Sir, could you bring forward a more cogent argument in favour of the infidel, that no Christianity existed at all?

The half hour here closed, when Mr. Maguire retired, accompanied by the Rev. Mr. M'Namara, amid loud cheering. The Rev. Mr. Gregg immediately commenced flourishing his picture, amid great laughter, and some manifestations of Conservatism. The Kentish fire was attempted to be got up, but was immediately put down by the overwhelming voice of the people. Fears were entertained that a riot would take place, in consequence of the excitement which prevailed; but, owing to the vigilance of the police, and the activity of their inspector, Mr. Murphy, every thing passed off quietly.

TRIBUTE OF RESPECT TO THE REV. T. MAGUIRE.

On Monday, the 11th of June, a most numerous and highly respectable meeting of the citizens of Dublin was held at the Corn-Exchange, for the purpose of taking into consideration the best means of paying a tribute of respect to the Rev. Mr. Maguire, the eminent and distinguished member of the Catholic church. The room was crowded to excess, and at three o'clock the Hon. GONVILLE FRENCH was called, by acclamation, to the chair.

On taking which he handed in 5*l.* as the subscription of Sir Thomas

Esmonde, Bart., who was prevented by illness from attending the meeting.

Mr. R. N. Fynn, Barrister-at-law, and secretary to the meeting, moved the first resolution.

The Rev. Mr. Miley, in rising to second the resolution, said—Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen, and Ladies, if discomfited fanaticism could be candid, or if the motives which assembled us were not liable to be misconceived, I should simply second the resolution, and retire. But, Sir, for the exacerbation of the public mind—for the desecration of the mysteries of God—for the outrage offered to matron honour, and virgin modesty—for the heartless immolation of the young, one side or the other is responsible—and, therefore, no man, above all, no priest of God, ought, in my mind, to identify himself with this proceeding, without vindicating his cause from even the most distant suspicion of such heinous guilt. To bring "glory to God in the highest, and, on earth, the peace of good will to men" was the end for which the Eternal Word became incarnate. This sentence is an inspired epitome of all religion; it is the grand consummation achieved by Christianity. Now, Sir, the instigator of religious discord reverses both these most sacred objects, for he exposes "the glory of God" to be profaned, and perverted into a cause of rancour and embittered hate that which was destined by the Saviour of the world to "the bond of peace and the balm of good will and reconciliation" among men. This impiety has been perpetrated amongst us. Sir, the fact is unquestionable. But, Sir, are the Catholics the culprits? Is he who stands upon the claim of immemorial prescription—the authenticity of whose title deeds, signed and sealed by the Lord paramount, is not even disputed, according to ordinary parlance—is he called an aggressor—is he so designated in any court of law on earth? Were the sons of Mathathias aggressors against Antiochus—the ancient Britons against Julius Cæsar—were our forefathers the invaders when they drove the Danes from the shores of Clontarf? Sir, the Catholic Church has always repelled invasion—she has waged and will continue that war of good against evil—of truth against falsehood, which was first led by the Archangel Michael against Lucifer, on the plains of Heaven—till that father of lies and of all iniquity is bound for ever, and the just shall reign in triumph with Christ. It would be easy to show that the Reformation, as it is called, was a wild, passionate, licentious insurrection, and that its author might have adopted the watch-word of Cataline. But we must domesticate our views; and, turning from the general history of the church to the annals of this particular province of Christendom, let us ascertain how religious discord came to Ireland; for, Sir, that is the question. Spirits of the sainted dead—Patrick, and Columbow, and Malachi—and thou, St. Lawrence, patron of our city and our church—was it Protestantism that ye planted and fostered in this island—was it the faith of Luther that ye preached? Is it the religion of the sanguinary Elizabeth, or of the martyred Plunkett, that ye bless? Oh, Sir, when it is read abroad that a man, recognised as the champion of ascendancy, applauded and cheered on in the assertion, maintained, in the face of a vast and well-dressed assemblage, that our forefathers, the men who gained this country the appellation of "the Island of Saints," where venerable Bede says that the scholars of Europe were not only educated, but supported, gratis—whose missionaries, are venerated as saints in Belgium, Flanders, France, Italy, by the descendants of those whom they converted—that the men

who, in the days of Charlemagne, were the professors of learning and the apostles of religion in Europe, were men who professed the thirty-nine articles of Elizabeth, pronounced the Mass to be damnable and idolatrous, the Pope Anti-Christ, and the Catholic religion apostacy. Why, Sir, pity for the idiotic fanaticism of the assertion will be mingled with acrid scorn for the lingering barbarism of which its approval by a party is a humiliating proof. No, Sir, from the day that Brown, the apostate Augustinian, was intruded by Henry the Eighth into the see of Dublin, until Magee drove us with ignominy from paying the melancholy tribute of an inspired prayer over the unoffending ashes of our lamented dead, aggression, insult, penal laws, and persecution, express the endearing offices for which the Catholics of Ireland are indebted to the establishment. And when the demand of millions to be emancipated was made to resound from this room through the soul of terrified oppression, it was this system of insult and invasion of conscience, by which the minions of ascendancy strove to disconcert our patriots by maddening the people that first dragged the man whom we have met to honour from the unobtrusive but meritorious obscurity of his wild parish upon the arena of polemical combat, and forced the young shepherd of the mountain to stretch the boasted champion of Philestism in the dust. When, inexperienced in the world, friendless, knowing only one man in this metropolis, and all he knew of him was that he was a sterling Catholic, a bookseller, and that he lived near a bridge—when, without a welcome, and with a scrip not over cumbersome for his calling, he alighted from the top of a stage coach, who could have anticipated such triumphant results? And, Sir, after the first day's discussion, did not a most experienced and penetrating man declare that the cause was lost, and that a rude, undisciplined missionary priest, from a remote mountain district, was not the man upon whom to risk the vindication of the Catholics of Ireland against a most gifted and accomplished champion, aided by the acumen and the research of the University.—Yet, Sir, did he not drive them from position after position—dislodge them from height after height, until he expelled them from all the territory of truth—and then, standing on the frontier, hurled ruin after them with the force of a Calista? Sir, in the opinion of the public, the dogmatic charges against our creed were then set at rest for ever. The infallibility of the church, transubstantiation, purgatory, invocation of saints, and the rest, were all disposed of upon Scriptural grounds; and, according to the testimony of the historians of the primitive church, completely to our satisfaction, and to the undissembled confusion of the aggressors. From that day the Scriptures were given up—the fathers were contemptuously rejected—the demand for "justice to Ireland" was waxing loud—ascendancy was up and stirring—reaction was indispensable—irritation and disturbance must be had at any price—the "no Popery" cry was to be raised in England; and, accordingly, the apostles of discord are canonically ordained, and sent by "the brethren that are in Ireland," to preach the gospel of "forgery" and discord throughout broad England, from end to end. They resorted no more to the oracles of truth—"nefarious devices," garbled extracts from obsolete scholastics, the revelations of Maria Monk, and every fabrication, home-made, or trans-Atlantic, was to them a vouchsafing—"a revelation," and a holy joy. A premium was offered to apostate priests, every obscene and drunken impostor was paraded by these religious incendiaries. They

assailed every man who was venerable, and him the most who by his virtues, his elevated character, and perfect life, has won praise and respect from all creeds and orders in the state. "No Popery," "No Priests," "No Nuns," "No Dens," "No Wafer God!" These were the blasphemous and outrageous things they wrote upon our door-posts, upon every edifice and corner of the city. Why, Sir, in these days the very flag-way beneath our feet reeked with insult, and the dead-walls of the city hooted us as we passed. O, Sir, we have had the patience of Job—God Almighty grant us his perseverance. These calumniators challenged us every where they went, dared us to meet them and disprove their assertions. The mountain pastor again came forth—he accepted the challenge, but the Gallileo of Dens and of the "ingenious device" was too keen not to prefer manœuvre to encounter in this case, and, therefore, prudently and not inappropriately left it to the minister of —— Swift's. He left it to the inspired man to prove to the benighted Irish that the church, as by law established within those realms, based on the Thirty-nine Articles, is—Holy! Catholic!! and Apostolic!!!—to prove that the church which reigned over the civilized world since the days of Constantine—to prove that Germany, Spain, France, England, Scotland, Ireland, and every country in Europe that is Christian to-day—to prove that that religion that adores the Blessed Trinity, holds the name of Jesus to be above all names, that defends every doctrine of Revelation, that has preserved the oracles of God, inculcated the most sublime morality—is the foul apostacy and the religion of Anti-Christ—that the religion of a Sir Thomas More, of a Charles Boromeo, a Francis Xavier, and a Vincent of Paul, is the vile fabrication of the devil. Sir, what toleration can the Catholics of Ireland expect if ever that party recover power that hold such doctrines and receive them with the Kentish fire? When the turbulent display of last Thursday is remembered the orgies that were celebrated round a man asserting his divine inspiration, and then pronouncing oracular excommunication against Unitarians and all Dissenters of the three kingdoms, and that the Papists were slaves of the devil, apostates doomed (groans)—Sir, that was a disastrous anathema for the establishment that excluded the Dissenters from salvation, after leading them into their present opinions. Sir, do you imagine that Irishmen, who are not insensible to insult, who have some fire in their veins, who cherish the creed of their forefathers more than their lives—think you, Sir, that they will come crouching like base-born dastardly Helots, to offer the fruits of their hard toil, their sweat and suffering, to pamper in luxury and in arrogance the men who stigmatize them as the scum of Europe, upbraid them even with the poverty which they have entailed upon them, and denounced their holy mysteries and ancient faith as the invention of the devil, and the effluvia of hell? In the 15th chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, verses 18 and 19. the Divine Author and Finisher of our faith lays it down—and, mind you, in contradistinction to the Pharisees—that the heart is the laboratory and workhouse of all moral guilt or merit—that vice and virtue are determined by the conception and desire of the heart, "for from the heart," he says "come forth evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false testimonies, blasphemies,—these are the things that defile a man." Now, sir; the same Redeemer left to the priests of his church an unrestricted, universal jurisdiction over the conscience, as far as absolving from, or deferring abso-

lution, from sin; for he says—"Whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven—whatsoever you loose on earth shall be loosed in in Heaven." Again, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven," &c. Therefore, Sir, it is evident that, by this universal unrestricted jurisdiction, which would be abortive and preposterous without a tribunal to try and to pronounce—that he who is the *scrutator eordium* the searcher of hearts, has placed and constituted the priesthood of his church in his own stead—to receive the confession of the most hidden mysteries of that heart from which all sin originates—to counsel, to warn, to purify by penance—to encourage with hope, and confirm in, by wise directions, that justice which the sacrament of reconciliation bestows. Therefore, Sir, to impeach and to denounce confession, as it is practised in the Catholic Church, is obviously to impugn the power or the wisdom of the Son of God. But it is an awful office to entrust to men surrounded with infirmity. Are not doctors and surgeons surrounded with infirmity? Yes, Sir, the Catholic Church tells her priesthood that this office is tremendous—that it was an "onus angelicis humeris formidandum"—a responsibility to be fixed even on angelic shoulders. Nor does she stop with warning; she requires a rigid probation of many years: seven is the course in our national college. During that period no care, no exhortation, no exercise is omitted that can implant and strengthen holy dispositions, secure spotless purity and aptitude for the after dispensation of the holy things of God. The candidates during the entire time are subject to constant and vigilant inspection; and if they exhibit any propensity opposed to the state and the functions they shall have in the ministry to discharge—nay, if they be deficient in decided proofs, evidences that they will, under God, be faithful stewards, virtuous, pure, and fervent servants of a most jealous Lord, they are rejected with inexorable sternness from the gate of the sanctuary. And, Sir, it is a striking evidence of the prudence of the selection that is made that there is, I believe, no instance of any candidate who was called, with the approbation of his superiors, to holy orders, having afterwards prevaricated; I know of none, while I know, of my own personal knowledge, that every single one of those unhappy men who have fallen of late years from their solemn vows to heaven, have been stigmatised by their superiors—rejected by them when they sought to be ordained—and after, entered the fold, not through the door, but, like the ravenous wolf, by vaulting over its inclosure (loud cheering). Before the candidate makes his vows the bishop warns the by-standers to inform upon him if they know him to be guilty of any uncanonical crime. He then advises the candidate that as yet he is free, and that if his heart falter, or that he apprehend his own incapacity, that he may, without reproach, retire, betake himself "*ad vota seculatia*," and enter upon some honourable pursuit in the world; but that, if he advance, he is bound for ever, that he is admonished that any future marriage attempted by him would be a sacrilegious adultery. Every writer upon the office of a confessor warns him never to administer the sacrament of penance without prayer and solemn preparation. It is the unanimous decision of moralists that, if after resorting to the remedies prescribed by the Redeemer himself, "fasting and prayer," we find the function to be an occasion of grievous temptation, they decide unanimously that he is bound to confine himself to the other offices of the priesthood. He knows that to allude, without the greatest prudence and absolute necessity, to those infirmities to which all the offspring of fallen man are born

heirs, exposes him to perpetual degradation from his office. We are commanded not to hear confessions but in the public church—yearly we are called into solitude to examine how we have fulfilled these tremendous duties of our ministry—to render an account to the Prince of Pastors, and by prayer, and penance, and meditation, to come forth renewed in the spirit of our minds (applause for some minutes). We hold it a mortal sin to read any matter considered dangerous to purity of mind, without the absolute necessity of our offices requires it. In our classes these subjects were more glanced at in general observations, and I have known not a few who, when, through a sense of duty, they read these parts of their tracts that treat of the 6th commandment, to do so after bringing their bodies into subjection to the spirit, as St, Paul did, and even studied upon their knees before the blesssed sacrament (hear, hear, and cheers). Now, Sir, is it Christian charity, is it justice, to villify a priesthood as we have been villified, for exercising, after so much preparation, care, and awful warning, an office given to them in charge by the Lord Jesus Christ himself? Nor can we defend or vindicate ourselves--for, like the Buccaneers upon the Spanish main, they have placed that which we cherish far more than life in the front of the battle, and we will die rather than outrage modesty (cheers). But, Sir, we are not without consolation. Sir, we are comforted by the cordial, the enthusiastic affections of our people (loud and long continued cheering). And let me say it, surrounded by the recollections of this room, that Irishmen are neither stupid nor lost to a sense of honour, and therefore that their cheers are our vindication; for if the priests of Ireland were what their enemies represent them, instead of hailing them with acclamations of attachment, they would drive them like reptiles from their shores (cheers). But we have even a higher consolation still, for our Divine Master tells us (Matthew chap. v, ver. 11), "Blessed are you when men shall persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you, lying, for my sake. Amen, I say to you, your reward is very great in heaven, for thus they persecuted the prophets from the beginning." Aye, even in the days of the Apostles, they accused the Catholics of infanticide, of all abominations; and the historian Tacitus, in recording the first great persecution under Nero, says that the Christians were guilty, not of burning the city, but of hatred to the human race. Thus have we been belied and misrepresented from the beginning, and we glory thus to suffer for justice sake, and with the just (applause). But, Sir, is the double-tongued calumny to be endured that at once accuses our church of *deifying virginity* and of *pandering to impurity*, or that that religion corrupts the female heart that has called forth in the most corrupt ages and countries whole communities of that sex, the various families of the virgin mother of our Saviour, devoting themselves with generous self-sacrifice to the education of the young—to affectionate nurses to the outcast victims of disease—to be daughters to old age, mothers to the abandoned orphan—to exhibit not cant and hypocritical pretension, but pure and undefiled religion before God and the Father, regaling the earth with the fragrance of their sanctity, and, like angels visible, pointing us the way to Paradise (great applause)? And by whom, Sir, are we impeached (hear, hear)? Why, by the progeny of an apostate monk and of a prevaricating nun. These are the first parents of the Reformation. As to the Anglican branch of the family, it is lineally descended from an adulterous despot (cheers). We are accused by the men who have countermanded the ordinance of Jesus Christ, and said—Man shall separate what God has united (expressions of horror), and by

their infamous doctrine of divorce held out a premium for adultery—by the men upon whose own sworn attestations we have it that their flocks are immersed in worse than Mahometan licentiousness (great cheering) by men whose prelacy—but, *nec nominetur inter nos*, says St. Paul. Oh, Sir, is not this the chaste, the pure Susannah, malignantly accused by the foul-minded and guilty elders (tremendous cheering for several minutes)? And, Sir, what have they done now? I protest, when I consider the diabolical recklessness of decency that the party have displayed, I feel as if Ireland on their own account was about to be excommunicated by indignant Christendom from the pale of civilization. The literal chronicle of their attempts surpass the horrors of Tiberius and Nero, even when drawn with the terrible pencil of a Tacitus. The carcase of concupiscence they have torn up from the grave, upon which had been accumulated the shame of 6,000 years. They have dragged it under the stare of day, and flung it in attitudes of perdition in the path of the innocent and the young. The historians of Italy tell us that in the great plague of Milan there were wretches who resorted to the lazar house, and, taking the matter of infection from the rotting dead, daubed with it the door-posts and persons of the uninfected, in order, by spreading the miasm of pestilence, to increase their plunder (cries of horror). Yet, Sir, what was the guilt of these defilers compared with the defilers of the immortal soul (loud bursts of applause)? Sir, I have trespassed upon your forbearance. I have outraged the patience of the meeting. I know not what the fastidious may say of interference such as mine, but my conscience assures me that I am not here as a partisan, but as one who deems it a sacred duty to warn innocence against the circulators of plague, and to vindicate the sacred priesthood of Melchizedec. I am here to attest my gratitude to the man who carried on, unaided by priest or people, two such splendid campaigns, achieved two such splendid victories, not over individuals, whether accomplished or infatuated, but over established error—that vexes the land, villifies the nation, and will not suffer the peace of good will to reign in Ireland. By his first controversy the Rev. Mr. Maguire exhibited the dogmatical charges of falsehood against our doctrines. He hunted and drove our enemies from every strong hold and entrenchment from which they endeavoured to assail the church. In this second discussion he carried the war into the heart of the establishment. He seized its very citadel, the Thirty-nine Articles, and shivered them to atoms. To use his own Herculean diction, in this last encounter he "knocked the brains out of Protestantism!" He demonstrated it to be without principle of Scripture or common sense, that it was a mass, a fabrication of inconsistencies, of despotism, and licentiousness of authority and free-thinking, of private individual judgment, and of creeds and articles to be sworn to on oath. I hope, and fervently supplicate heaven, that the great men who direct our political destinies may speedily rob these religious disturbers of their occupation by the concessions of justice, and removing the incentives that perpetuate persecution. But, should they ever again, drag the laborious priest from the fulfilment of his obscure but paramount occupations before the public, to account to the world for his faith, let them depend upon it that we shall set the Reformation in a light before the world in which it has never yet been exhibited, and convict it of defacing the instincts of morality, of bewildering the mind, making it the victim of imposture the most gross, of withering the arts, of consuming the life of poetry, the spirit and life of

literature, and, instead of conducting the great intellectual universe into harmonious unity, of dissolving society into its aboriginal atom, and plunging the social system into chaos. It shall be the finale to display the inadequacy of Protestantism to meet the new form which mankind is so fast assuming—when every art is cultivated with zeal, when the remotest ends of the earth are brought into neighbourhood by the extraordinary means of intercourse, and by that universal sympathy and consciousness which is fast pervading the human race through the wonderful agency of the press. The press, Sir, and steam are catholicising the nations; they will soon become too enlightened not to be unanimous, and whenever mankind kneel around one altar, united by charity in the bonds of peace, it must be within the pale of that religion which can contain "the notions" whose dogmas have never changed, whose morality has a remedy for the prodigal and a new work of perfection for the saint, which sanctifies every order and every state of life, which is independent of all forms of government, flourishing alike in the free Canton of Switzerland and under the despotism of Nero. They will become the children of that religion which has expanded with the human race, and progressed with time, while the Reformation, since the days of Elizabeth, *i. e.* during the last two hundred years, had stood still, labouring like a culprit upon the tread-mill. But, Sir, I conclude with one fact; that, although the Foreign Missionary Societies of England have expended £1,000 per diem, collected from the penny of the poor servant to the thousand of the benevolent millioner, and translated the Bible into all living languages, that their own reports demonstrate that they have never converted one section—one province—one tribe—one town—city—or hamlet to Christianity. Sir, I second the resolution with delight; may its call be as successful as it deserves.

The Rev. Dr. Kernan, Bishop of Clogher, moved the next resolution. He said that he felt great pleasure in doing so. It was to the effect that a day be named within a month, for a national collection to be made as a tribute from the people of Ireland towards a man who had so ably defended their religion.

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Young.

Mr. James Martin here handed in 28*l.* 12s. 6d., which had been collected in small sums. The announcement was received with tremendous cheering.

Mr. Richard O'Gorman moved the next resolution; which was seconded by the Rev. Dr. Keenan.

Councillor Kernan next proposed, that Robert N. Fynn, Esq., be requested to act as Secretary, and John Darcy, Esq., be appointed Treasurer for receiving the tribute to the Rev. Mr. Maguire.

A Committee was then appointed to manage the fund, after which a vote of thanks was passed to the Rev. Mr. M'Namara (Mr. Maguire s Chairman) also to Mr. Coyne of Capel-street, and the meeting separated.

Since the above meeting, the subscriptions have already swelled to a very large amount. Several Protestants have forwarded their contributions, amomg whom are seven Presbyterian gentlemen, who sent two pounds each.

A meeting of the Catholics of Liverpool, headed by the indefatigable and highly respected pastor of St. Anthony's Church, the Rev. P. Wilcox, has been held for the above object, whose example, we trust, will be followed throughout England, inasmuch as Catholics owe a deep debt of gratitude to the Rev. Mr. Maguire, for his bold and invincible defence of their holy religion.

GREGG'S INSPIRED EPISTLE TO THE *ROMANS*.

The following letter of the Rev. T. D. GREGG, deserves to be recorded as a curiosity—as a specimen of the temper and style of a modern apostle, writing, as he boasts, under the influence and inspiration of the Holy Spirit. We therefore attach it to our report of the Discussion.

TO THE IDOLATROUS PRIEST MAGUIRE.

IDOL PRIEST—If you had wit to bear your defeat with patience, pure compassion would have caused me to treat you with respect. If you had the common decency to treat an honourable, highminded, victorious opponent with becoming reverence, I would have hoped well of you, and you should have experienced at my hands that charitable forbearance, which is something like owing to the vanquished when they are humble and submissive.—But you are driven headlong by your vanity, and, when you might have stood fair as a candidate for public pity, you fling away the happy opportunity, and seem determined to partake of nothing better than the general contempt. *This* you shall have I promise you.

Why, Sir, how do you dare to talk of yourself as other than a pitiably beaten man? I protest, before the face of the public, that I was sick with smiting you, and out of the tenderness of my nature I would have relaxed the severity of the discipline that I was bestowing on you if it were not that I feared the wrath of the Lord, and that I had sounding in my ears those awful words—"Thus saith the Lord, because thou hast let go out of thy hands a man whom I appointed to utter destruction, therefore thy life shall go for his life, and thy people for his people."—1st Kings, xx. But it seems you are not yet utterly destroyed; then, Sir, I will use the press to finish this goodly work; for, as surely as I live, your time is very nearly full come.

And now mark—I shall not allow my reverend friend, Mr. Nangle, to notice your letter. No, Sir, you are mine. I claim you as my heritage forever. Your quarrel is with me—with me shall be your battle. We shall have no lagging correspondence between a distant and fully occupied minister at the far end of Ireland—occupied in the noble work of leading our deluded countrymen, by hundreds, to fling their idols to the moles and to the bats—and a Priest of Baal, flushed with the *placebo* of his blinded flowers. We shall have no such lagging correspondence as this to fall asleep over between a second and a principal; but we shall have close fighting, day about—letters between the principlas themselves, upon the spot—those with whom the public are mainly concerned, and in whom the great interest is felt. Now, Sir,

I. *I shall take your objections to my proceeding in the discussion, one by one, to show their folly,*

II. *I shall characterize your mode of proceeding in the discussion, to show your weakness—your miserable weakness; and*

III. *I shall touch upon a few additional points, to show your wisdom, and the nature of it.*

I. *Then as to your objections,—and*

1st. "I came there to preach." Aye, Sir, and I did preach—and to some purpose too. But who told you that I did not come there to reason? I am sure I did not. I told you that I did not come there to sophisticate—that I did not come there to chop miserable logic with you, to trifle with your paltry, drivilling, Thomistic sylogisms, whereby you blind the eyes of the people, involve their souls in ruin, and rob them of their money. This was what I told you. I never told you I did not come there to reason. But "to preach is to rant, and not to reason." I dare say so the poor people in Ballinamore know to their cost. But I beg to inform you that *your* definition of preaching, though it may be sound and valid in your apostate synagogue of Satan and Ballinamore, is not applicable to the practice of our Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, in which to preach means to argue, to reason, to convince.

2dly—"He said that his church was invisible for eight hundred years." Let me tell you a story:—One of the shrewd Dublin priests, who, by adhering to the wise rules of Dr. Murray, kept never minding me, and was thus instrumental in compelling me to drag out a useless existence in the obscurity of my alley, when he had been disgusted by your imbecility during one of the days of the discussion, in which you hammered on visible and invisible. and invisible and visible, and visible and invisible again and again—I say one of the shrewd Dublin foxes, as he was going out of the room, addressed a brother fox—one of the bachelors—saying, "Alas! alas! what's to become of us? I wish Father Tom had staid at home with his dogs!" I little wonder at the aspiration, when I see that you are puerile enough still to effect ignorance of my meaning on this point. Sir, you know in your heart that your objection is a wretched, miserable cavil, without either sense or reason. Pray, does the sun cease to exist because he may be obscured by a cloud?—is there no gold in a mixed mass before it has undergone the influence of the refiner's fire?—is there no corn in a field because the laziness of louzy friars has allowed it to be overrun with cockles and darnel? Away with your sophistry!! Pray, how much salt would it take to make a hogshead of holy water? Come, Sir, answer me that question. *There* is something suited to your school of divinity. For as to expecting you to grapple with subjects worthy of a divine, or to treat honest and sensible views with manly and Christian candour, I have long since resigned the thought as hopeless. Now, come; pray, do, like a worthy priest of Belial, as you are, *do* tell us, how

many holy candles it would take to drive away the devils that tempt a poor Irishman to get drunk? Oh, it would have been well for the bachelors that you had stuck to your dog and your gun!

3dly—"His church is neither fallible or infallible." Sir, our Holy Catholic Church is the pillar and the ground of truth—that holy church against which the gates of hell never shall prevail. No, never! I repudiate from my theology the words *fallible* and *infallible*. They are neither in the Scripture nor the Creeds; they have caught the leprosy in Old Rome; the words are leprous words; they have been so long abused by the Whore of Babylon that they are fit for nothing but her necromancies. Your church, Sir, I tell you plainly, is the church of the devil; and it is proper that we should renounce all epithets, good, bad, or indifferent, which have been peculiarly applied to her.

4thly—"Private judgment is the rule of faith, and public judgment is the rule of faith; the Holy Ghost is the author of both; and, in case of collision, which would be the Holy Ghost against the Holy Ghost, he would not tell us which was to be preferred."

Now, salt blesser! inasmuch as here your understanding, emasculated by Popish delusions, may really feel a difficulty, I shall condescend to instruct you. Come, then, to my knee, thou Mass-priest, and learn wisdom.

MARK, THEN, SIR, THE WORD OF GOD IS THE SOLE RULE OF FAITH.

Now, 1st, God has spoken, and recorded what he has spoken in the Holy Scriptures.

2dly—The holy church, taught of God, has pronounced and does pronounce her views of Scripture in her creeds and articles.

3dly—God does by his Spirit open to all his children, to each of them in particular, the true meaning of Scripture.

There is, in fact, never any collision between the Spirit of God speaking in a private individual, and the same Spirit speaking through the holy church.

If an humble private individual judge differently from the holy church, he will pray for light, and wait for it, and in due time he will come to a perfect agreement on all vital points with all the holy brethren—with the queen church.

But if a spirit in an individual be at collision with the spirit in the holy church, and obstinately continue so, the spirit in the individual is not the Spirit of God, but the spirit of the devil, and the conclusion of the individual is not so much private judgment as private misjudgment.

Are you answered, Mr. Maguire?

But, Sir, how can you affect to misunderstand? What miserable schoolboyism you are guilty of? I ask you now on paper, where there is no running away from the question, is there not a public judgment in the mathematical world? and is there not a right of private judgment, also, a full and free right to it? And yet if a man stood up and declared that he had discovered that two and three made six, would he not be laughed at? And suppose he maintained his ground, and said I have a right to draw the conclusion, what should I say? Why I should say, to be sure, you have the right, but you are an ass all the while.

But, Sir, here is the whole secret of your Thomistical prevarications. Your lying church asserts absurdities as great as that two and three are six; four and six are seventy-five; and twice three are 666. Ah, Sir, that's a sore number for you. That number makes you sick. I have no doubt it fills you full of alarms. But do I not speak the truth? Is it not gross and offensive absurdity in the sight of God to pretend to drive the devil by a thundering exorcism out of salt. Only conceive, exorcising salt! and then putting a little of it into the mouth of a person to be baptized! saying, "May it be a propitiation to thee for life everlasting."—*Roman Ritual.* Is not this absurd, Sir, when God declares that his son, Jesus Christ, alone is the propitiation of our sins? Is it not grossly absurd to stand up before God, and insult him by a long and ridiculous prayer that he should drive the devil out of lime and sand, and that he should pour the grace and effusion of his Holy Spirit upon sticks and stones, and I don't know what besides? No wonder, Sir, that you rage and rave at a right of private judgment which would at once overthrow the tyrannical usurpations of your apostate church; but rave or rage as you will, down it goes.

5thly—"He said that he believed the inspiration of Scriptures on the authority of his church, thus making his church the ultimate rule of faith."

Oh, miserable infatuation of Popery! I tell you, Sir, "you are drunken, but not with wine; you stagger, but not with strong drink."

So, then, if I believe the inspirations of Scripture upon the strong argumeuts of Paley, for instance—forsooth Paley is my ultimate rule of faith! Well might the Dublin priest wish that you had staid at home with your dogs. But, *I* say to you, stay here, and write such letters as your last, and we shall soon be delivered from the plague of Popery. So then, according to the "matchless priest Maguire," if I believe, on the Rev. Mr. Nolan's authority, that that nasty old gentleman, Doctor Batchelor Bailly's book is the class book of Maynooth, Mr. Nolan is the rule of my opinions with respect to the very nice dainty things which the young gentlemen of that very decent establishment are instructed in, although he never may have said one single word to govern my opinions on the subject!

I tell you, Sir, no matter on whose authority I originally believed that the Scriptures were inspired, there is a light and evidence in the Scriptures themselves which evidently prove that they are from God.

6thly—"He would give me no answer, but he gave it to the audience."

I *did* give you an answer, which on your own principles you should have been content

with. But I had no notion of permitting you to play the Infidel, the Socinian, and the Atheist, as it might suit your convenience, in order to keep me from assailing the strong holds of Popery.

7thly—I was more than ready for you every day, as you know to your cost.

8thly—I assert that your denying the absolute necessity for the possession of the Holy Ghost, by each individual Christian, is the blackest brand of your apostacy, for by that denial you give the denial to God, who says, "If ANY man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his."—Romans viii. 9. And again, "God has sealed us and given us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts."—2 Cor. i. 22. And again, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God."—Romans, viii. 16. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, I am enabled to assert, by a happy experience, that these texts are indeed realized to the soul of the believer.

But the whole purpose, object, and end of your apostate church is to cast God out of the soul, and to give it up to the possession of the devil, that, when it is filled full of darkness and ignorance, the bachelors may defile it, pollute it, and trade with it according to their own pleasure.

I deny, with both my hands, that I alleged a personal inspiration on my own part as a ground on which you should receive any thing.

1st—I gave you Scripture—opened Scripture—as the reason for every point on which we differed.

2d—I gave you the authority of our church—the holy Catholic Church—for those points on which we agreed—but

3d—I alleged the teaching of the Holy Spirit as an evidence for myself alone.

However,

II. *Let us consider how you acted in the discussion.*

1st—I demonstrated the apostacy of your church from the 2d chapter of 2d Peter.

You gave me no answer.

2dly—I demonstrated the apostacy of your church from the 11th of Revelations.

You gave me no answer.

3dly—I demonstrated the apostacy of your church from the 17th chapter of Revelations.

You gave me no answer.

4thly—I demonstrated the apostacy of your church from the 12th and 13th of Revelations.

You gave me no answer.

5thly—I demonstrated the apostacy of your church from the 2d of Daniel.

You took a night to think of it, and yet you could not find a word of reply.

6thly—I demonstrated the apostacy of your church from the 7th of Daniel.

You were dumbfoundered—you did well not to touch it.

7thly—You perverted Matthew v. 21 and 22, and I proved it.

8thly—You made God the rewarder of sin by Joshua, the 2d chapter.

I exposed the horrid blasphemy.

9thly—You denied your Saviour Jesus Christ by Matthew, xix., 16 to 22.

I made plain the apostacy.

10thly—You asserted that no man could commit a sin without will, contrary to Levit. v. 17, and the whole Scripture.

11thly—You asserted that Popish priests were married to the church, but the church is married to Christ; consequently the church which you marry must be a whore.

But it would be a vain task to go through all your errors—all your heresies, and your blasphemies. I have got them by me, and I venture to say they are not less than a round hundred. It is, however, my intention to open them up at my earliest leisure, and expose to the world what a very pretty defender the Popish church has got in your person. A man who could stand up before 3,000 persons, and going into all the details, tell them the touching narrative of the murder of Thomas à Becket, and inform them that he lost his life in contending for magna charta, having been put to death by the tyrant John, although it is notorious that the man was murdered two reigns before John, and then you blundered, forsooth, "because you belonged to an infallible church!"

But why do I talk? It was not on the last day you were beaten. You could not stand before me one single day during the discussion. You shook—you trembled—you raged—you fumed—you were regularly run dry—you were pumped out—and for lack of matter you were going over the same thing again and again, until the neutrals pitied you, your friends were ashamed of you, and your enemies laughed you to scorn.

Call to mind the termination of each day's discussion. You remember how my friends rushed up the platform, seized me by the hands, with tears of joy in their eyes, almost embraced me, crying out, "thank God," "Glory be to God," "you have triumphed gloriously"—while you precipitately retreated, rarely receiving any thing but a look of reproach from some of the disappointed bachelors—the bachelors so very careful of morality that they never rest content until they know the exact nature of the conduct of husband and wife even in the marriage bed, and whose prying curiosity in every Popish country but Ireland makes the women all whores and the men all assassins. In Ireland the light and air of Protestantism keeps our people tolerably safe in spite of you.

But you were not beaten! Well, it is no wonder! after all, that I failed! Alas me! *I* was never doctored by a mass priest—never was *I* touched by holy spittle—never was *I* rubbed with holy oil. But mark me, Sir, the next time I meet you I will procure a sprig of holy palm, and then let me see if you can match me!

III. *And lastly, let me dwell upon your wisdom.*

You were wise when you ran away, for I do hereby inform you that the longer you stood before me, the more thouroughly you and your apostate church would have been exposed.

But come, Sir! now, Sir, I take you to task. I ask you, Sir, how did you dare to calumniate the English women, by asserting that any Irishman who went to work in the cotton mills could have his choice promiscuously of any dozen of the English girls? I ask you, Sir, how did you dare to utter so foul a calumny? I pronounce it to be as false a libel as ever was uttered—a barefaced lie, without the shadow of an existence in reality—an atrocious, abominable, and detestable lie. Pray, Sir, which of the parsons swore to this fact? In which of your records do you find it? I will tell you where you found it: you found it amongst those standard calumnies, which the priests of your lying apostacy circulate among their flocks, that they may defame the glory of Protestant England—*of virtuous, of moral, of holy England—the land of purity, integrity, and highmindedness.* We can easily see the forge from which Mr. O'Connell derives his tools. It is little wonder that Popish laymen calumniate our women when Popish priests—when *the* priest—"the matchless Priest Maguire"—the spotless pure Maguire," as the song says, can stand up before 3,000 men and add insult to injury by his foul importations of calumny. Ah, Sir, you were very wise to stop before that question was investigated.

But I have done with you for the present; provoke me further, and in my next rejoinder you may depend on it I will give you and your Popery such a showing up, please God, as it has not got since the Reformation.

You brought this letter on yourself; but now, in conclusion, let me tell you that your own letter convicts you of the very thing you want to get rid of, namely, a defeat. You say I ranted—why, then, did you not expose my rant? Why did you not make me a laughing stock to the community? Sir, there is not one species of opponent I could so easily put down as a ranter or a canter—there is not one character that so soon wears himself out, and the patience of his audience, as a ranter. How comes it then, with such a weakling to oppose you, you ran away? There is no country in the world were such a question will meet so ready an answer as in Ireland, and from Irishmen. You ran away, simply because, you were beaten.

And now, Priest Maguire, be quiet for the sake of your apostate church.

Vestry, Free Church, Swift's-alley, T. D. GREGG.
15th June, 1838.

ERRATA.

Page 18, tenth line from the top, *for* "census composito, or censu diviso," *read* "sensu composito, or sensu diviso." Same page, third line from the bottom, *for* "a particulari ad generalum non valid conscientio," *read* "a particulari ad generalem non valit conscientio'.' Page 19, last line but one of the first day, *for* "more," *read* "none."

P. & M. ANDREWS, Catholic Printers, 3, Duke Street, Little Britain.

239.6
THOMAS HUBARD G 62
Gregg, Rev. Mr.
AUTHOR
The Controversial Discussion
TITLE between Rev. Maguire and
Rev. Gregg